SELECT WRITINGS AND SPEECHES OF MAULANA MOHAMED ALI

Vol. II

SELECT
WRITINGS AND SPEECHES
OF
MAULANA MOHAMED ALI

VOLUME II

Compiled & Edited by
AFZAL IQBAL
Fellow, Royal Society of Arts

★

SH. MUHAMMAD ASHRAF
KASHMIRI BAZAR - LAHORE (PAKISTAN)

First Edition (in one volume)
1944
Second Edition, July 1963
Reprinted, December, 1969

PRINTED AT ASHRAF PRESS, LAHORE, AND
PUBLISHED BY SH. MUHAMMAD ASHRAF
KASHMIRI BAZAR, LAHORE (PAKISTAN)

To

NINI

who is so quiet and
withdrawing

FOREWORD

If the great Saiyid Jamal-ud-din al-Afghani was the precursor of the renaissance of the world of Islam, after its decadence and downfall in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of the Christian era, Saiyid Ahmad Khan, Founder of the Aligarh Movement, must be acknowledged as the saviour of Muslim India, after the upheaval of 1857 and the disappearance of the shadow of the Great Mughals from the Lal Qila of Delhi. Saiyid Jamal-ud-din did not agree with his Indian cousin Saiyid Ahmad because he felt that the Aligarh Movement was being built up at the instigation and under the patronage of the new British rulers of India. Had al-Afghani witnessed the horrors of the mutiny and the total uprooting of Muslim society in this country and probed deeper into the idealism of Saiyid Ahmad, he would have realised that the objective before himself and his Indian counterpart was one and the same, that is the rehabilitation and reformation of Muslims so that they may live an honourable life again as a nation. Saiyid Jamal-ud-din showed impatience. He wanted quick results. The task before the Indian leader was different from and harder than what Madhat Pasha was called upon to do in Turkey or Mufti Muhammad Abdou and his colleagues in Egypt. Nasir-ud-din Qachar and his son Muzaffar-ud-din in Iran and Ameer Abdur Rahman in Afghanistan, too, were differently situated. The Movement associated with the name of Aligarh and Saiyid Ahmad Khan had to contend against a set of circumstances not to be found in other countries. The Muslims in India had lost an empire, howsoever weak and decrepit it had become. The coin of the Great Mughal was still current and so were the greatness and prestige of his name.

With the transportation of Muhammad Bahadur Shah "Zafar," the last Emperor, and his heir apparent Prince Jawan

Bakht, to Rangoon and Moulmein, in Burma, not Delhi alone but every centre of Muslim culture and civilisation became dormant as if under a national sleeping sickness. The only danger to the new rulers of the country was the possibility of a cohesion among the Muslim fraternity. Other elements of the population were divided into castes and spoke different languages. The policy adopted by the successors of the East India Company was, therefore, directed to break the Muslims physically, mentally and spiritually. Men of the type of William Hunter and Bishop Webber, from their respective angles of vision, did what they could to further it. Even William Muir, the head of the administration in the area where Muslims had managed to escape annihilation, utilised his knowledge of Oriental languages to strike the Muslims at the most tender part of their hearts, by writing about the Founder of the Faith and the last Messenger of Allah in an unbecoming language and manner.

Another aspect of the new situation which worsened it was the attitude adopted by the huge non-Muslim majority against its erstwhile rulers under the shadow of the new dispensation. For the non-Muslims it was a change of masters and a change of language from Persian into English. A natural consequence of this was that they saw nothing wrong in carrying out the behests of the new masters even better than the masters themselves had ever dreamt of. Leaders in Muslim states and countries had to deal with Muslim majorities and, good or bad, were masters of their own policies and statecraft. The handicaps in the path of Saiyid Ahmad Khan were, thus, many and formidable and yet the Aligarh Movement went ahead expanding and gaining more and more ground educationally, socially and politically. The circumspection and caution used by Saiyid Ahmad Khan may have made his Movement appear slow in the eyes of enthusiasts, but its progress was uniform and steady and it gave substantial and permanent results.

Aligarh has produced many men of fame and eminence; it will be no exaggeration to state that Mohamed Ali must be given the place of honour for the good reason that among them all he understood Saiyid Ahmad Khan's objective and idealism best

and gave the Aligarh Movement a new push forward about the turn of the century and continued to do so until his death in London while still in harness. Years before he started the *Comrade*, he began to expose the weakness that had crept into Aligarh, after the passing away of the founder, his articles published under the caption "Aligarh of To-day" in the *Observer* of Lahore, made the Trustees of the M.A.-O. College sit up. Mohamed Ali wanted to put right the fountainhead of the Muslim Movement first. Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Sir Theodore Morrison put him down as a firebrand who was out to undo Sir Saiyid Ahmad's great work. The next stage in Mohamed Ali's orbit of public service, while still a member of the Baroda State Civil Service, was his brochure on the general political situation in the country, under the little *Thoughts on the Present Discontent*, on which, had he read it, even Edmund Burke would have complimented him and acknowledged in him a worthy successor. The book created almost a sensation and the Opium Commissioner of Mehsana and the Naib-Subah of Navsari gained fame as perhaps the foremost exponent of India and Muslim political thought.

Nawab Imad-ul-Mulk Saiyid Hussain Bilgrami was reported to have drafted the Address presented to Lord Minto by the Muslim Deputation which waited upon him in 1906 at Simla, under the leadership of His Highness the Agha Khan, in which it demanded a change from nomination to representation on behalf of the Muslims through their own separate electoral college. The response was favourable and Muslim India began to think of its own political organisation to ventilate its peculiar and special grievance. It has, again, to be acknowledged with sincere gratefulness that Mohamed Ali put the Muslim League on its feet at Dacca, in December 1906, by giving it shape and telling Muslim India, through the mouth of Sir Salimullah, the then Nawab Bahadur of Dacca, how it could maintain its identity in the country and yet take the fullest part in the Indian struggle for freedom. Since then his connexion with the Muslim League remained constant until death put it asunder.

Financial difficulties kept him tied down to his job in Baroda State, for four years more, during which Sir Michael O'Dwyer,

the Agent to the Governor-General in Central India, offered him the Prime Ministership of Jaora. Other equally attractive offers came from other quarters and his chances of promotion in Baroda itself were bright. He had, however, ruminated over the problem of starting a newspaper that would advocate the Muslim viewpoint which, due to the cautious and formative policy of Saiyid Ahmad Khan, had been grossly misunderstood by the Congress and Hindu school of politicians. He risked all and, as he himself put it, followed the example of Tariq, the Conqueror of Spain, burnt his boats and gave up the idea of ever going back to any profession. The *Comrade*, his bright weekly, a star of the first magnitude in the firmament of journalism, took India by storm. Nothing like it in appearance and in its contents had ever appeared before. It went on performing its self-imposed duty as long as the terrible Press Act of India, Mohamed Ali's internment at Chhindwara, his imprisonment in Betul Jail and other punishments permitted. The *Comrade* taught the University-educated Muslims the Islamic outlook of domestic and world politics just as *Al-Hilal* did the Urdu and Persian-knowing section and the *Zamindar*, the man in the street and the villagers in their evening meeting places. Iqbal and Shibli gave their help by way of poetry, serious and otherwise. Mohamed Ali's following was the greatest and in time as the *Comrade* expanded in its influence and name, his fame spread over Turkey, Egypt, Syria and almost every part of the Muslim world. The Muslim Indian structure of to-day was raised by Mohamed Ali on the foundations laid by Saiyid Ahmad Khan.

The war in Tripoli, the Balkan War of 1912, the British policy in Egypt as propounded by Lord Cromer and followed by his successors gave Mohamed Ali the fullest scope to wield his pen freely and tell his co-religionists in India and outside how best they could safeguard their own interests and thwart the mischief and intrigues af their enemies. His release and soon after that his arrest and the Karachi Trial are matters of history. His fight here was that man-made law could not take precedence over Divine Commandments and Inhibitions. He paid the fullest penalty for his conviction later. Presidentship of the League,

the Khilafat Conference and the Congress came one after another, but his leadership of the Khilafat Delegation to London was one of the most outstanding contributions of Mohamed Ali to the Islamic cause. Not in *London* alone but in *Paris*, in *Rome*, in the Vatican and in Turkey he carried the flaming torch of his enthusiasm and faith with ever-increasing effulgence. The last great service of Mohamed Ali to his country was his great speech at the Round Table Conference, the long dictation of which actually was the immediate cause of his death. Whatever views his countrymen may hold about him, those who knew him intimately feel with conviction that his services to Islam and mankind were approved by Allah for without Divine blessing he would not have been rewarded with a grave within the holy precincts of the *Masjid-i-Aqsa* and under the shadow of the *Gumbad-i-Sakhra*.

Calcutta ABDUR RAHMAN SIDDIQI

EDITOR'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The First edition of this book came out in 1944. As a young student at the Government College, Lahore, I was greatly attracted to the dynamic personality of Mohamed Ali. As Chief Editor of "The Ravi" and President of the College Union, I was keenly interested in the twin arts of writing and speaking. Mohamed Ali, as a great writer and a great orater, fired my imagination. The spell has not broken nor diminished over the two decades which have passed since I started compiling and editing his writings and speeches.

The book has been out of print for several years and is now being published, for the first time, in Pakistan.

> *For the first time also is being published the 'Choice of the Turks'—the famous article of Mohamed Ali which shook the British Government to the core. I was not allowed permission to release it by the Government of India in 1944 and I am glad that the readers will now have an opportunity to read this historic article.*

As a statesman Mohamed Ali occupies a unique position in the history of the Muslim struggle for Independence. Pakistan, therefore, owes a heavy debt of gratitude to him and I have no doubt that the publication of his 'Select Writings and Speeches,' for the first time in this country, will be greatly welcomed. There is ample source-material in this book as well as in the one I published under the title of 'My Life—A Fragment' and I hope some bright young Pakistani will produce a biography of Mohamed Ali, a work which remains to be done.

AFZAL IQBAL

INTRODUCTION

Mohamed Ali was an unfortunate baby. He was not yet two when Abdul Ali, his father, died. Abdul Ali was a Rampur courtier and like any gentleman lived in debts. He left many hostages to fortune but little fortune to sustain them. His widow had to maintain half a dozen children on the income of a small estate which was sadly encumbered. But she was a brave woman. She refused to remarry, and she refused to accept any help. Yet she managed to bring up her children better than any one else in Rampur. She was perhaps the first lady in the town who sent up her boy for education in English. Learning English in those days was a dangerous thing. For her it meant strong opposition from the uncle of the boy ; for the boy it meant the none too welcome title of an 'infidel'.

The uncle who managed the property was, like his deceased brother, a member of the Rampur nobility. It did not, therefore, behove him that his nephew should violate the traditions of the family. Nevertheless, he somehow tolerated Zulfiqar, but he lost all patience when Shaukat was also selected for a course of education in English. One infidel was bad enough in the family, but he would not tolerate another. He refused to sanction Shaukat's school expenses. The uncle was bitter in his opposition, but the boy's mother was equally resolute in her determination. With the help of a maid-servaht of a Hindu neighbour, she secretly pawned some personal jewellery and sent Shaukat to school. When the uncle was thus outwitted, he got the jewellery released from pawn and paid for the schooling of both his nephews.

And so when young Mohamed Ali sought perdition, there was no need of any clandestine negotiations with the pawnbroker. Mohamed Ali went to school, first in Rampur, then in Bareilly and eventually to Aligarh. As a child he was a tricky

lad. He played a little too much with boisterous, romping boys and girls, and was a nuisance for his mother. What is worse, he listened surreptitiously to the conversation of his elder cousins in the *Mardana*. As a student there was nothing remarkable about him except his prodigious memory and unruly habits. He received praise from Shibli Naumani for the former, and some rough handling from his 'Big Brother' for the latter.

On the whole he lived in perfect, uninterrupted obscurity, till in 1896 he surprised everyone by obtaining the first position in B.A. in the Allahabad University, an institution which, in those days, examined the alumni of all colleges and schools in U.P. and in some adjoining provinces and States. It was a great honour that the truant had earned, and his 'Big Brother' who had hitherto not condescended to take much notice of this inconsequential boy except for grabbing his soholarship money, now set about to make amends for his past neglect. Shaukat Ali was at this time in superior Government service and was earning a respectable salary. Even then it was extremely difficult for him to raise sufficient funds to cover the expenses of Mohamed Ali's education in England. But handicaps notwithstanding, he managed to work the miracle, and his beloved "Mohamed" was soon on the high seas.

At Oxford, he took an Honours Degree in Modern History. His 'Big Brother' had intended him to enter the much-coveted Indian Civil Service but, thanks to an English spring, the miracle did not work this time. Now, as láter in his life, Mohamed Ali's loss was the gain of his country.

After four years in England he came back to India and joined service, first in Rampur and then in Baroda. While in the service of the Gaekwad, Mohamed Ali made a momentous decision. He decided to become a journalist, and to be that he had to move to Calcutta—the seat of the Imperial Government. This was a serious departure, especially for a comfortable district officer—who had no special claim or training to venture on this hazardous profession. But Mohamed Ali had made up his mind. He knew that, under the circumstances, this was the only way to serve his country. He also knew that in this venture he

had to sacrifice all and to expect no material gain. Maharaja Sayaji Rao, the Gaekwad, did not like to relieve him of his responsibilities in the State. Mohamed Ali disguised his departure as two years' 'leave without pay.' That was by no means the last hurdle. While still in Baroda, he received seductive offers from two other States. He may yet have wavered and accepted them. But he firmly closed his eyes to all temptations, and hurriedly left for Calcutta to start the 'Comrade'— 'comrade of all and partisan of none,' as he put it. But Providence, it appeared, was not willing to let him off so easily. There was another test. He reached Calcutta on a hazy, misty morning on the New Year's Day in 1911. On reaching there, he received a bulky telegram, pressing him to accept the Chief Minister's post in yet another State. The offer was backed by no less a person than Sir Michael O'Dwyer. The temptation was great but then Mohamed Ali had a mission. He could not both eat the cake and have it. Like Nelson applying the telescope to the blind eye, Mohamed Ali kept the telegram unopened till his paper was on sale in the streets of Calcutta.

The first issue came out on January 11, 1911—exactly ten days after the new editor had reached Calcutta. This famous editor of a famous paper had no office as such. He had no finances, he had no stenographer, he had no typewriter, he had not even a clerk to help him. A paltry sum of Rs. 250 was borrowed from Syed (now Sir) Sultan Ahmad, and the circular was wrapped up and pasted by his life-long friend AbdurRahman Siddiqi, who was later to become the Mayor of Calcutta and then the Governor of East Pakistan.

Born in abject poverty, the *Comrade* took the journalistic world of India by storm. It was hailed as the 'new star in the firmament of Indian journalism.' Mohamed Ali who had timidly made his first bow to the journalistic footlights had now come right in front of them. He criticised the Government with characteristic frankness, and soon lost grace with it. But true to himself, he preferred the grace of God to the grace of the Government and continued to fight it. He steered the *Comrade* through its various phases in India; he started the *Muslim*

Outlook in England, and piloted *Echo de l'Islam* in Paris.

Mohamed Ali, as an eminent Englishman said, had the heart of Napoleon, the tongue of Burke and the pen of Macaulay. And what is more fortunate, he had the faith of a believer. A man in possession of the secret of Truth, with head and heart at bursting point and his blood tingling in every vein of his body, he felt more like a bomb ready to explode than a human being who could deliberate, decide and control his actions and speech. Realising that it was not enough to fight with his pen alone, he came out in the field and joined the ranks.

As a worker, his principal asset was his sincerity—a rare phenomenon in politics. He was sincere to his cause, he was sincere to his comrades and, above all, he was sincere to himself. To this, more than to any other quality, he owed his success, and not a few of his failures. Frank, blunt and outspoken, Mohamed Ali knew no diplomacy. He considered all mental reservations villainous and outrageous offences springing from a serious flaw of character. Either a cause was just or it was not. If it was, he threw the whole weight of his personality into the struggle and fought for it to the finish; and if not, he fought it to the bitter end. His convictions were deep and his enthusiasm boundless. He inspires us by the fire that kindled in him. By his simplicity, sincerity and missionary zeal he reached the heart of the masses and captured them as no one had done before. For the first time in the political history of India, thirty thousand men and women went to jail in thirty days[1]—thirty days which shook the country and nearly paralysed the British rule. For the first time in the political history of India five to twenty lacs of human beings left their country at the bidding of their leader. So pervasive was the passion for liberty that even Moplas were roused out of their poverty and ignorance to set up a Khilafat kingdom along the far-flung Malabar coast. It seemed that India had at last realised her new dreams, her new pride and dignity, her unity and strength.

It is not very difficult to understand the unique influence of Mohamed Ali. He fired the imagination of his countrymen and

1. December-January 1920-21.

won their allegiance to the cause he had given them.

"I had long been convinced," says he, "that here in this country of hundreds of millions of human beings, intensely attached to religion, and yet infinitely split up into communities, sects and denominations, Providence has created for us the mission of solving a unique problem and working out a new synthesis. It is nothihg less than a Federation of Faiths. The lines of cleavage are too deeply marked to permit a unity other than federal and yet the cleavage is not territorial or racial in character but religious." [1]

It is to this synthesis that we must look for an explanation of Mohamed Ali's life and work. For him Islam and India were in no way antithetic, they only indicated two equally important spheres of action.

"Where God commands I am a Muslim first, a Muslim second and a Muslim last, and nothing but a Muslim. But where India is concerned, I am an Indian first, an Indian second, and an Indian last, and nothing but an Indian."

India was one circle in which he moved; he worked and died for it. Islam was another circle in which he moved; he worked and died in it. Living in one circle, if he found that his brethren in the other were in trouble, it gave him the same pangs as if his own child were on death bed. For instance, imagine Mohamed Ali—the Curzon hatted Oxford man—sitting one autumn night in 1912, in his office in Calcutta. The latest message of *Reuter* brings the news that the Bulgarians are only twenty-five miles from Constantinople—a name which conjures up the highest hopes and deepest emotions in the Muslim mind. As he reads the telegram, blood rushes to his head and colour leaves his face. His feelings become so over-powering that he gets up from his chair and looks about for a rope—to commit suicide.

But for the unexpected appearance of a friend who nearly broke open the door, and took him away from the office, his career might have ended before it had hardly started.

Or again imagine Mohamed Ali—this time in Delhi—in

1. *My Life : A Fragment*, p 35.

1914. Diabetic, bed-ridden and recently operated upon for an abcess, he receives the gist of an article by the *London Times*. The article, in his opinion, was intended to damage the best interests of Turks—a people far removed from his own yet part of his very being. He forgoes sleep, rest and food, and sits up for forty hours to write that fateful leader called 'The Choice of the Turks.'

Mohamed Ali harmoniously blended his love for Islam with his love for India. The man who was driven to attempt suicide by his love for Islam was only too ready to face the gallows for the sake of his country. In 1921, he narrowly missed it. But undaunted, the heroic fight for freedom continued. He fought on with growing years and failing health. It was a tough fight—this fight against age and ailment.

Immediately before his departure for England where he went to attend the Third Round Table Conference in 1930, Mohamed Ali was confined to bed in a hospital. The lady who was lying next to his bed asked the doctor: "What is this old man ailing from?" The doctor said, "Ask me rather what the old men is not ailing from!"

This old man who was suffering from a dozen serious diseases got himself transported on a stretcher to the railway station and went seven thousand miles of land and sea to secure India's freedom. Sitting in a chair he spoke in the Plenary Session of the Third Round Table Conference.

"I want to go back to my country," he said, "if I can go back with the substance of freedom in my hand, and if you do not give us freedom in India, you will have to give me a grave here."

What he uttered was no empty phrase. The British Government did not give freedom to India, but Mohamed Ali won a grave in a free country. He died in London on January 3, 1931 —exactly a month and a half after he had uttered the fateful words.

The treasure was carried to Jerusalem and buried in the place of the Prophets.

He gave his life for India but denied her his body.

Iqbal, the Bard of East, wrote a touching poem at the death of his comrade; he nearly felt jealous of his sublime end :

یک نفس جان نزاد او تپید اندر فرنگ
تا مژه برهم زنیم از ماه و پروین در گذشت
اے خوشا مشت غبار او کہ از جزب حرم
از کنار اندلس و از ساحل بر بر گذشت
خاک قدس او را بہ آغوش تمنا در گرفت
سوئے گردون رفت زان راہے کہ پیغمبر گذشت
می نگنجد جز بہ آن خاکے کہ پاک از رنگ و بوست
بندۂ کو از تمیز اسود و احمر گذشت
جلوۂ او تا ابد باقی بہ چشم آ سیاست
گرچہ آن نور نگاہ خاور از خاور گذشت

AFZAL IQBAL

The fallowing is the translation of an Arabic poem by Showqi, a famous Arab poet, which he wrote at the time of the burial of M. Mohamed Ali in Jerusalem

Jerusalem is built on the sacred land, its environments are
permeated with justice through and through,
The victory is its banner, and purity its sign and holiness one
of its names,
Lowering its shoulders on the Islamic people, the arch of the
holy land is reaching Sinai
Who can dispute the ownership of the keys of its doors, the
majesty of its throne and its land?
Mohamed praying on its site, receiving forgiveness all round.
Today people assembled round his grave, angels gathering in
a sky festival.
O Jerusalem! Prepare from your land a garden for the buried
one [Mohamed Ali] and celebrate his meeting.
His is from God's swords (glory) or from Indian swords when
needed.
The Prophet opened his habitation freely, welcoming him in
his removal,
Champion of the rights of the Orient and the Muslim cause,
Precious India did not let him forget his feeling for eastern
problems.
His garments weaved in India, can you see;
They buried the leader shrouded with his garments.
The Nile remembers his voice and the Turks could not forget
his bravery,
Tell the leader Mohamed [Ali] into the Nile sorrow fell and
filled it.
Going towards him in tears offering sorrow and condolence
to your brother [Maulana Showkat Ali],
You passed the Nile and he took you in his flank.
Had you waited, he would have kept you in his heart.
It was used to your passing through it, as fast as the clouds
pass over.
Sleep near God, you are not a stranger because you are one of
his children;
Victory is a holy case, and you struggled under its wings,
The Mufti[1] of Palestine had caused your burial in the Holy
Land,
You lived supporting the people of Palestine, how can you be
a stranger?

1. Al-Haj Amin al-Husaini.

CONTENTS

INDIA'S MESSAGE TO FRANCE

An appeal for the preservation and a warning against the dismemberment of Khilafat in Turkey. The speech was delivered in Paris on 21st March, 1920.

I

INDIA'S MESSAGE TO FRANCE

I HAVE to apologise for not being such a polyglot person as I suppose I ought to be as a member of one of the subject races dominated over by Europe. I have learned the English language besides my own mother tongue and a few other Indian and Oriental languages, but I find that though I am among the Allies of England, my English will not carry me very far. Well, ladies and gentlemen, we have been deputed by the 70 millions of Muslims of India and by the 250 millions of their compatriots of other faiths, who in this matter ardently sympathise with and support them.

On their behalf and on our own, I thank you very heartily for the very kind and generous response you have made to our invitation at such a short notice.

France has been noted throughout the world for her widely extended sympathies and her humanity, and in any case it would not have been unnatural for us to expect from France a ready response to the call of righteousness and humanity. But our soldiers who came from India in the hour of your great need, and have now returned home after having shared with you the perils and privations of a devastating war, have carried with them the happiest recollection of your gratitude and of your good-will, and it is but natural that we should expect from the good people of France consideration and respect for the most binding obligations of our faith and the most cherished sentiments of our nation. France, that has suffered so much in the war and is yet so beset with difficulties today in spite of victory, can well sympathise with those hundreds of millions who share our faith or our motherland and are a prey just now to terrible anxieties

and corroding cares that deprive them of rest by day and sleep by night.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here not to represent Turkey and the Turks, but to represent ourselves and our country, namely India. When the Turks come here they will have their own case to represent to you, but we who have come today in your midst do not present the Turkish case but the case of the Muslims of India and of all their compatriots who in this matter stand shoulder to shoulder with them. And our case is this: It is not that we have come here to save any territories. It is not that we came here to save any financial resources. We have come here merely to ask you to spare us the one thing which to us is more than all territories, the one thing which is more than all financial resources, and that is the liberty of our conscience. (Cheers) We have come to you, the people of France, to preserve us, and to help us in preserving the sanctity of our souls. (Cheers.) This question which has brought us, as I said before, is not merely a Turkish question. It is an Islamic question, an Indian question, an Algerian question, and a Tunisian question. It is the question of the preservation of the Khilafat. The Khilafat is the most essential institution of the Muslim community throughout the world. A vast majority of the Muslims of the world recognise the Sultan of Turkey to be the Commander of the Faithful, and the Successor and Khalifa of their Prophet. It is an essential part of this doctrine that the Khalifa, the Commander of the Faithful, should have adequate territories, adequate military and naval resources, adequate financial resources. But for what purpose? Not for aggression, nor even for the defence of Turkey, but for the defence of our Faith. He is to stand before the world as the leader of the Muslims in this cause, and whenever the liberty of conscience of the Muslim in any part of the world is placed in jeopardy, he should at least be able to say to the aggressor, "You shall not do that with impunity." (Cheers.)

That is the main thesis of our claim. Apart from that is our second claim, namely, that there are certain territories which are the local centres of our Faith just as the Khilafat is

the personal centre of our Faith. They are known to us as Jazirat-ul-Arab, an expression which it may be somewhat difficult for you to understand. "Jazirah" in the Arabian language means an island: the sacred region which is the local centre of our Faith, is and has always been to us an island, though to European geographers Arabia is not an island but a peninsula. When our great Prophet (on whom be peace and God's benediction) was departing from this world, he laid on the Muslims of the world an injunction, a great charge, that in this one spot on God's earth, in this sanctuary of our Faith, we should not permit any non-Muslim control. The boundaries of Arabia as a peninsula are known to you, but in order to understand how that same Arabia, which is a peninsula to you, becomes an island to us, you must understand that while it is bounded on three sides by the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, on the fourth side it is bounded by the rivers Euphrates and Tigris. Therefore, in addition to the Peninsula of Arabia, it includes Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine. For more than 1,300 years these have remained in exclusively Muslim control, and we still want exclusive Muslim control there, not because in Mesopotamia we seek oil, as Mr. Lloyd George seeks oil in Mosul, but because we seek there the birthplaces and the graves of the great Prophets of the world. (Loud cheers.) For the most part these regions are not properly cultivated, and in places not even cultivatable. Before Mr. Lloyd George found oil there they were not very rich in other resources also. But when we first found in our hearts an attachment for them, they were dear to us, not because they were the centre of God's kingdom already come, but a land of the prophets; and we who consider ourselves not altogether alien to Christians and Jews, we who are the true heirs of Jesus Christ, Moses and Abraham (on all of whom be peace), for we recognise all the Prophets from Adam to Muhammad, we say that we cannot give up the wardenship of this one spot on God's earth without betraying the great trust that was imposed upon us as His servants and His alone by the Almighty God. (Cheers).

In this region of the Jazirat-ul-Arab are the three great sanctuaries of Islam—Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem. Yes, Jerusalem, as dear to us as it could be to any Christian or Jew. They are all alike held sacred by us and we have always maintained Jerusalem as a sacred trust, not only for Muslims, but for Jews and Christians, without any disparity and without any difference.

Apart from these three Sacred Harems, we have the Sacred Shrines in Mesopotamia, Najaf, Karbela, Sammara, Kazimain and Baghdad. All these, according to the Islamic commandments, must always remain in the custody and wardenship of the *Khalifa*.

This then is our threefold claim: That the Khilafat shall not be dismembered, but that the Khalifa shall have sufficient temporal power for the defence of the Faith, that in the Island of Arabia there shall be exclusive Muslim control without mandate or protection, and that the Khalifa shall remain as heretofore the Warden of the Holy Places. And, ladies and gentlemen, you will have to acknowledge that we are very modest in our claim. We do not say that we want to be masters of the world, as a French journalist tried to make out when discussing our claims with us. We do not want as great power as France, Germany or England, but just power enough to defend our Faith and just one bit of territory specially entrusted to our care. The sum total of our claim is the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*. But we do not want to rule out political changes which would guarantee not only security of life and property to non-Turkish races, whether Muslim or Christian or Jew, but also opportunities of autonomous development. We who come from India know how it is possible for a community that is in a minority to have its interests safeguarded, for we ourselves are just such a community.

Having achieved the purpose of the defence and protection of our rights we have fought the battle of Indian freedom by the side of our compatriots, and today the Hindus, Muslims, and Parsees are standing shoulder to shoulder even in this

matter, which is a purely religious matter . . . the question of the Khilafat and of the Holy Places. Therefore, we cannot by any means desire to rule out autonomous development for the Christians in Armenia, for the Jews in Palestine, for the Arabs there and in Syria and in Mesopotamia. The Arabs are of our Faith, are our brethren in Faith; we do not by any means rule out opportunities for autonomous development for them, and we who are a subject race ourselves, do not want anyone else to suffer the humiliation of being a subject race without having a voice in the administration of her own affairs.

This is our claim: The War, this most unprecedented of wars—its horrors have been unprecedented, its weapons have been unprecedented, the extent of its slaughter of mankind has been unprecedented—this War is over and has long been over. After such a war it would have been natural to expect that people would be tired of war. And yet today, nearly a year and a half after the Armistice, today nearly a year after peace has been concluded with Germany, which was believed to menace Europe and cannot menace anyone today—what do we find? Peace has not yet resumed her sway over mankind. Peace is not in the hearts of men today. And if in the hour of your triumph, a triumph achieved with the assistance of Indian soldiers, of Muslim soldiers, if today you say to those who were your partners in way, "You shall not be our partners in peace": you made the war, you saved the war, but today you shall not make the peace and the kind of peace we like, then, ladies and gentlemen, it is my painful duty to tell you, and I tell you on behalf of over 300 million people, of whose feelings today you have no conception, that these people will unite to a man and unite to a woman and will not tolerate such a peace. (Loud cheers.)

My friend, Mr. Syed Hossain, will explain to you what the situation in India is today. When you have heard him you will realise that you have not yet closed the chapter of war, and you cannot say, "Into this book we will look no more." On the contrary you will find that the world stands today on a precipice, on the brink of another and perhaps a greater war. In

this hour of your triumph you must realise that peace hath her victories no less renowned than war. You must realise that true religious conviction is a greater thing than material strength. You must realise that it is not sufficient to have large territories as spoils of war; that it is necessary to convince mankind that you respect its religion, and that because you are great and strong you cannot force the conscience of the small and the weak. If you save to us the liberty of our conscience, then and then only will you have peace. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

My friend will tell you that if the people who are meeting today at San Remo behind closed doors think that in this way three or four people can gather together and settle the destinies of mankind, they are very much mistaken. People are now determined that they will not tolerate a peace that is entirely against their conscience and entirely against their Faith, and that is at variance with the pledges given to them in the name of England, France and Russia; pledges that this war would not involve questions of a religious character, that their Holy Places will remain immune from attack or molestation, that the religious obligations of the Muslims should be respected, that the Turkish patrons of the Ottoman Empire will remain Turkish, and that for the rest security for life and property would be guaranteed and opportunities of autonomous development would be afforded. If these pledges are not carried out, and if unfortunately anything happens in India, as I am bound to say it is likely to do, it will be very difficult for France or Italy to avoid trouble altogether. Trouble may begin in India, but it will not end in India.

Ladies and gentlemen, you do not know and we cannot forecast today what repercussions it will have in the East. But you who have large commitments in the East, I think it is necessary in your own interests that you should take heed today while there is yet time, and we come to you in the friendliest spirits to give you a friendly warning. Is it not necessary and proper that one friend should come to another in such grave contingencies as are in view and give a friendly warning of the

danger ahead? We hope that in your own interests you will do what you can to influence your Government, and to save another war, for which not even Europe is prepared today.

But more than this; as friends of England we hope that you will use your privilege as a friend to warn England also and advise her and tell her that she is facing a real and not a fancied danger.

This is all that I would say now, and I am afraid that I have bored you a good deal already by speaking in an unfamiliar language. It was a Frenchman, I believe, who wrote that man was born free and everywhere he is in chains. And if mankind is today in chains, it will be, I hope, a Frenchman who will break those chains.

There was a time when the French went out to the East in the hope of conquering India. But it was destined for another Power to conquer India, if India can be said to have been really conquered. But today you have an opportunity of conquering not the land but the hearts of India, and, I say to you, *Vive La France* !

A PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO LIVE

A speech delivered at Essex Hall, London, on 23rd March, 1920, to vindicate Turkey's right to a national existence.

II

A PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO LIVE

I HAVE come here in the heart of democracy from a part of the world which is somewhat notorious for its autocratic ways even in the twentieth century. But I have found it very difficult to realise the great change that 7,000 miles of land and sea should have made. We found that a propaganda had been carried on here for a long time past by the enemies of the Turks. We could afford neither the money nor the morals for a similar propaganda in favour of our views. But something had to be done. The message with which we were charged had to be delivered; the warning which was entrusted to us had to be conveyed. We found very few indeed who could sympathise with the Turks, for, not only have the Turks fallen today on evil times, but, what is worse, they have also fallen on evil tongues. Of course, there are Englishmen who know the Turks and they all sympathise with them. I have not yet come across a man who has fought against the Turks who does not speak well of them. (Hear, hear.) But there is the large mass of stay-at-home Britons who do not know the Turk at all, and harbour the prejudices so sedulously sought by his enemies to be eternally perpetuated. In these circumstances people have come to us and said: "Do not put your demands too high. Do not rub the English people the wrong way. If you go to them wearing the mantle of moderation you will succeed." I asked myself: "Am I really living in the land of democracy today where those in authority have to take their politics from the people, or in a land of autocrats where hundreds of millions of people have to take their politics from a handful of alien autocrats?" (Hear, hear.) When we arrived in this country we were asked not to represent the views which we had been sent to represent, but to chime in

with the views and fancies of the autocrats in high quarters. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I decided that I would not "moderate"—they are moderate enough in all conscience—the claims of our people, but to deliver the message with which we have been charged. I am not going to hurl our mandate at you; I am prepared to reason with you, to argue with you, to explain to you as clearly as I can what is not clear, what is new, and what is on the face of it startling, and I hope I may rely on the ancient English tradition of fair play and an open mind. (Cheers.) Imperialists, exploiters, and people with axes to grind are leading up to a most serious situation in the British Empire. If you value the Empire you will give us a patient hearing, and carefully consider what we have to say. In certain quarters efforts have been made to belittle the Delegation. Ladies and gentlemen, I will tell you who we are and whom we represent. We have been sent to this country by the All-India Khilafat Conference, the largest and most representative national body in India of recent times. The Indian National Congress and the Muslim League are large and important political bodies, but the body we represent is larger and more comprehensive than these. Twenty thousand Hindus and Muslims attended the third session of the All-India Khilafat Conference that has sent this Delegation and its proceedings lasted from 5 o'clock in the evening to two next morning and I have never in my experience of Indian meetings seen anything like the enthusiasm that marked these proceedings. Then, consider for a moment the huge crowds that greeted my brother and myself on our release in large cities like Delhi, Lahore, Amritsar, Meerut, Karachi, Bombay, Lucknow, Cawnpore, and Aligarh, and that greeted my brother Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and the deportees of Amritsar and other victims of "Special Tribunal Justice" when they visited Calcutta. The same enthusiasm was visible in the smaller towns and villages of India that insisted on our visiting them and going through them in procession. Think of the enthusiasm exhibited by the people all along our route as we travelled to Bombay and while we were there, on our way to England. I wish Printing House Square was really as omniscient as it makes itsef out to be. And what is happening now? Telegrams of approbation have arrived from

all over India, for example, one from a great meeting of 15,000 in a comparatively small place like Chittagong, to mention only one. It is the people who have sent us here and not an unrepresentative officialdom. As to our antecedents, some of us have certainly suffered imprisonment without any kind of trial at all, but merely on the *letters de cachets* of the executive, for purely religious activities, and, indeed, in India the law has been so administered that the best of men have been forced to regard imprisonment as an honour. Need I appeal in your country to your past history? Have not the Pyms and Hampdens of England suffered to secure the liberties of which Englishmen are so proud? I ask you Englishmen and Englishwomen not to deprive us also of the right to be heard on behalf of our people merely because your representatives in India deprived us of our liberties. (Cheers.) Mr. Lloyd George said in Downing Street last Friday that he had consulted representative Muslim opinion, and shown the greatest consideration and deference to your Indian fellow-subjects. I should like to know whom the Government have heard. Not one of the seventy millions of Indian Muslims was represented at the Peace Conference. Lord Sinha, a personal friend of mine, for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, if not veneration, does not represent the mind of India today. If the Government believes it has secured two sets of opinions from India, let it publish what the second and unknown section has really said at the Peace Conference. The real voice of India was stifled. When a man was thought likely to say something undesirable he was interned. Journals were suppressed, and no newspaper truly representing the views of Indian Muslims was allowed to exist. I can give the names of a dozen newspapers that had an average life of not more than six months not because there was no reading public to appreciate their views, but because the reading public appreciated those views only too well. They were shut out from province after province under the Indian D.O.R.A., and then came down the Sword of Damocles, the Press Act, which was admittedly based on an Austrian model, if you please. My own English weekly, *The Comrade*, was thus suppressed, for the security that has to be given for "good behaviour" at the very outset by every journalist for his paper and

his press, as if he was a confirmed criminal, was declared forfeited on account of the publication of an article that was being praised by *The Morning Post*, *The Daily Telegraph*, and *The New Statesman* here almost on the very day that the order of forfeiture was issued in India. My Urdu daily, *The Hamdard*, was strangled by the pre-censorship that was set up under D.O.R.A., although it had been praised for its excellent tone during the war by the same official that now killed it without the least previous warning. I mention these two only as typical instances, and not because I was singled out for such repression. The same policy was followed with regard to Muslim public men. They were interned under D.O.R.A., and even imprisoned. One of the leading and most respected religious authorities, one of the greatest religious divines, Maulana Mahmud Hasan Sahib, of the famous religious seminary of Deoband, which had been thoroughly intimidated into flabby submission to the powers that be, an old man of seventy had to leave India after our internment, because he feared he would be required to sign something in the name of religion, as so many others had been required, that his conscience entirely abhorred. He migrated to Mecca, the sanctuary where, at least, Muslim conscience is expected to be safe from outrage and coercion. But although he escaped from India, he could not escape the demand that he feared. He naturally refused to comply. And what was the result? He was arrested in the very sanctuary of Islam through the Shareef and deported to Egypt.

Perhaps it was feared that the mere presence of an honest and conscientious man would cast its spell over the Egyptians; he was removed to Malta, and is still kept there in spite of the recent Royal Proclamation; and at one time complaints were heard that he and his party were underfed. I do not know whether the same treatment is continued or not, but I know this, that some sort of a conditional offer of release was made to him which was refused, in the words of Joseph, in the Chapter of the Quran of that name. "O Lord, prison is dearer to me than that to which they invite me." The whole of Muslim India indignantly protests against such an outrage, and if his release is not

ordered immediately, the consequences will be of the gravest nature.

My own internment and that of my brother resulted, on Mr. Montagu's arrival in India, in a revival of the protests that had continually been made before, and he was deluged with about a hundred thousand telegrams, all received in a single day, demanding our release. I have already referred to the enthusiastic ovation that we received on our release after four years' internment and seven months' imprisonment. It would be very agreeable to us, indeed, if we could honestly regard all this as a personal tribute to us. But that we cannot. It is a tribute rather to the Khilafat, with which we expressed and promoted sympathy, as we were bound by our faith to do. If this is a matter of reproach in the estimation of the "Times," all I can say is that to us and to our friends and relations it is, and will continue to be, a matter of pride. These are our "irreproachable antecedents," and this our "unquestionable and high standing." What is more, the very people whom the "Times" would credit with such antecedents and such standing are fully supporting us today, and men that cannot yet be called "politically-minded" are religious-minded enough to say to us, "God bless you, and prosper you."

We are therefore entitled to say that we represent the people of India on this question. Two of us have been journalists who assisted in voicing Indian opinion and have been sent here because we were not unfamiliar with British politics. But our people have sent along with us an Oriental scholar and divine of great eminence to represent the Ulama of India, since the issue, so far as we are concerned, is a religious one, and it was necessary to have adequate representation of religious bodies in India. More men would have come with us but time was passing and it was decided to send the first batch at once. Others are shortly expected and many more would follow if the Indian claims can secure a hearing. So much for our credentials, although I should have thought that no question of this kind would arise after our cordial reception by His Excellency the Viceroy, whose Government facilitated our departure for Europe and America.

And now about the character of our Mission. We are

sometimes asked why it is that we who are not Turks and have had no political or racial association with them, have come all this way to interest ourselves in the Turkish Settlement. But this is not going to be merely a Turkish Settlement. We hold no brief for the Turks but are the advocates of Indian claims. We speak not for the Turks but speak for ourselves. And here I must explain the nature and scope of Islam which makes this not a Turkish but an Islamic question. Islam does not recognise geographical and racial barriers such as the nationalism of modern Europe has set up in the way of the freest human intercourse and the widest human sympathies. In a word, it is not national but supernational. We do not worship in the shrines of a nationalism that has for its creed "My country, right or wrong." (Cheers.) And, one would have thought that after this horrible war, in which human ingenuity was taxed to its furthest capacity to devise means, not for the preservation, but for the destruction of mankind, a war that was clearly the only logical conclusion of the cult of nationalism, it was time Europe ceased to worship this Moloch of modern Nationalism. To the Muslims of India the Turk is not only a man, but a brother, and that not because he shares with us a common domicile or a common parentage—things that can and do distinguish breeds of dogs and horses from other breeds—but because he shares with us a common outlook on life and common institutions and laws that materialise that outlook and perpetuate the culture of Islam. (Cheers.) The Turk and we are alike charged with a mission for the uplift of mankind and claim to be the heirs of all the ages and of all the Prophets. We may have hitherto failed in our mission; we may have betrayed the great Divine trust. But while you may condemn us and look down upon us, the mission that we have been charged with by Islam cannot be looked down upon and condemned. It is clear that I am no "apologist" for Islam. There is nothing to "apologise" for, and if we attempt an "apology for Islam" we lose the entire case at once. If you will permit the use of the phrase in a friendly way, far from apologising for Islam we have to carry the war "into the enemy's own country." But what a war? Not a war of poison gas, or Dreadnoughts or Tanks or Howit-

zers, but a war of reason, of persuasion, of influencing you with whatever we have of nobility and goodness and charity, for the Quran lays it down clearly and emphatically that "There is no compulsion in faith." Well, ladies and gentlemen, I was explaining why it was that we are interested in this so-called Turkish Settlement. I have told you that Islam is supernational and not national, that the basis of Islamic sympathy is not a common domicile or common parentage, but a common outlook on life and common culture. And the embodiment of that common culture is the Khilafat. Islam is not a bundle of dogmas and doctrines that theologians plague humanity with. It is a complete scheme of life, a perfect code of right conduct and a comprehensive social polity as wide as the human race and in fact as wide as the entire creation. And it has two centres. The personal centre is the Khalifa and the local centre is the Island of Arabia, the Sanctuary of Islam, the Land of the Prophets. The Khalifa is the Commander of the Faithful and his commands must be obeyed by all Muslims so long, and so long only, as they are not at variance with the Commandments of God and the Traditions of His Prophet. But since there is to be no lacerating distinction between things temporal and things spiritual, the Khalifa is something more than a Pope and cannot be "Vaticanised." But he is also less than the Pope, for he is not infallible and in all matters in which Muslims cannot see eye to eye with him the final arbiter is Allah Himself and we must refer back to the Quran and the Traditions of the Prophet. We are not therefore at his mercy and human conscience is still free. In fact, if he persists in un-Islamic conduct we can depose him, and have deposed him more than once. But so long as he orders only that which Islam demands we must support him. He and no other ruler is the Defender of *our* Faith. (Cheers.)

And now a word about "temporal power." Since Islam is not a thing for Sundays and Sabbaths only, or for Fridays only, if you prefer that, the Khalifa is not there merely to repeat his beads. His chief function has always been the defence of our faith, and it would be curious indeed if, when Christendom had

apparently discarded the Sermon on the Mount from its political code, and it was not the meek that inherited the Kingdom of the Earth, Islam should be asked to defend itself by turning the left cheek to him who smote the right cheek. All that a Muslim is and all that a Muslim has, including physical prowess, are part of a Divine trust to be spent in serving God and carrying out His purposes, and no Muslim can keep back anything required for the defence of Islam without gross betrayal of that Divine trust. If force ceased to be used in settling the affairs of mankind the Muslim would be the first to surrender his arms, and turn his sword and scimitar into a ploughshare. (Cheers.) But what do we see today? Viscount Bryce wants the Allies to use the argument of the "Big Stick" against the Khilafat. It is true that he says Orientals can understand no other argument. Now, could that abject being, a mere Oriental, ask his Lordship what other argument he thinks the Occidental understands? We shall say nothing about the Allies, and we are on less dangerous ground if we refer to Germans and Austrians and Bolsheviks. Are these not of the West Western, and what argument other than that of the "Big Stick" did they understand? Is Germany converted to the pursuit of peace by his Lordship's eloquence, or by the "Bigger Stick" of the Allies? (Laughter.) Well, so long as there are your Bryces and your "Big Sticks," we, too, must have some sort of a stick for the defence of our faith, and to jeopardise at least the dominance of those that jeopardise the freedom of our conscience. (Cheers.) That, and that alone, is the *rationale* of our main claim that the Khilafat should be preserved with adequate temporal power. (Cheers.) But if you think you can please the Muslims of India by allowing the Turks to retain Constantinople in such a way that the Khalifa is worse than the Pope at the Vatican—the Pope at Avignon—and, in fact, worse, for he would be the prisoner of people of an alien race and faith, then, ladies and gentlemen, you know very little of Islam and the Muslims, or of India and the Indians. (Cheers.) That affront shall never be tolerated, and if you think that by placarding the fact that Indian Muslim soldiers have been dragooned into this wretched business, you can make out that all this "agitation" is "fictitious"

and "factitious," then you will be compelling the Indian Muslim soldiery to disprove this lie in a manner that will be far too unambiguous for your tastes or for ours. Beware, beware. (Cheers.)

The first claim of the Indian Muslims I have already stated. It is that the Khilafat should be preserved with temporal power adequate for the defence of the Faith, and the irreducible minimum that is the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*, while taking guarantees from Turkey consistently with her independence and dignity as a Sovereign State for security of life and property and opportunities of autonomous development of all races, Christian, Muslim, and Jew. This is a region in which compromise was possible and we have made it. This is not the best but by a long way the second best. We ask, after the remorseless spoliation of Turkey for centuries, which deprived her of territories in Europe and in Africa, including the "shameless brigandage" in Tripoli, as it was characterised by the Allies of Italy themselves, are we not most moderate in claiming that the remnant of territory and power left to Turkey after the Balkan War should be left to her and to Islam? There was a time when the great statesmen of Europe and America, and particularly President Wilson, spoke as if a new heaven and a new earth were to be created after this war, and if the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine is an act of justice, surely the restoration of the territories torn from Turkey in Europe to the Turks, and of Tripoli to the Arabs if not to the Turks and of Egypt to the Egyptians if not to the suzerain Power must be regarded as an act of bare justice. But we do not ask for that, though we are in hearty sympathy with the claim of our brethren in those parts for undisturbed self-determination. What we ask for is after all so little that people who used to insist on a two-keels-to-one standard cannot but regard as extremely moderate. The power of Germany is broken, while the Allies are still strong. Do they fear a Turkish menace as they used to fear a German menace? That is not thinkable. England may have lost a good many things, but surely she has not lost her sporting instinct, and she could not have lost her nerve to the extent of insisting on complete

destruction of Turkey for her own safety. Not by such tremors are great Empires won and retained. (Cheers,)

Our second claim is that the Island of Arabia, the fourth boundary being the Euphrates and the Tigris, should remain in exclusive Muslim control, and since it would be idle to suggest your handing over some other territory to the Khalifa, for the preservation of the Khilafat, that main claim of ours necessitates that this entire region which includes Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia should remain within the scheme of Ottoman Sovereignty. For the most part it is a barren tract, though even at this distance we can smell the oil that is attracting you to Mestopotamia as it attracted you to the Persian Gulf. The Holiest of Holies lies in an "uncultivable valley." But every grain of sand of that sacred soil is dearer to us than tons of gold, and we who claim to be the true successors of Abraham, of Moses and of Jesus—on all of whom be peace and God's benedictions—as we claim to be the successors of the Last of the Prophets—on whom be peace and God's benedictions—are charged with keeping this land safe for Theocracy and the worship of One God. Even if the Turks were to tolerate any form of non-Muslim control over any part of this region the Indian Muslims and Muslims of the rest of the world would still have to fight and die for keeping the sanctity of this soil inviolate But if you fear that India is vulnerable from the Persian Gulf the security that you seek does not lie in the military occupation of Mesopotamia but in trusting your own Indian fellow-subjects with arms and as the organisers of a National Militia. (Cheers.)

As for the Arabs, who could have greater sympathy with them than the Muslims of the world. (Cheers) Was not our Prophet an Arab? Is not Arabic the language of the Quran and of the Traditions? Is it not towards Mecca that we turn our faces when we pray five times a day, and is it not in Medina—the Medina that gave asylum to the Prophet and his Companions, and stood by his latest successor to the end—is it not there that so many of us long to secure, if only as a grave? (Cheers.) No, ladies and gentlemen, you cannot expect us to believe that the Supreme Council and the Allies love the Arabs as much as we do.

In fact, no Turk could claim from us the affection that is reserved for the people of the Prophet. But it is not a question of Arab or Turk. It is a question of Islam—(cheers)—and Islam is dearer to us than Arab or Turk, as it must be to Arabs and Turks themselves. This question of Arab autonomy can well be left to Muslims themselves to settle, and I foresee no great difficulty in the realisation of our dream of a federation that will give the Arab all the freedom he needs or demands. The same afternoon that Viscount Bryce was brandishing his "Big stick" in the House of Lords, another noble lord, Lord Sydenham, wanted to know why the Montenegrins were being placed under Serbian rule, and he was assured by yet another noble lord, Lord Curzon, that it was to the interest of the Montenegrins to be part and parcel of a larger unit, the Yugo-Slavs, than cut themselves adrift, or, rather, retain their original independence. Now, why was the Arab being asked to cut himself adrift from the Ottoman Empire if not to be swallowed up as so many Eastern Kingdoms had in recent times been swallowed up? (Cheers.) The fact is, the temporal power of Islam could not be swallowed up in one bite, and it was proposed to swallow it up in two, the Turk today and the Arab tomorrow. (Cheers.)

Our third claim is that the Holy Places, namely, the three Sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, and the Holy Shrines in Mesopotamia should remain in the custody and under the Wardenship of the Khalifa himself. The claim with regard to the exclusive Muslim control of the Island of Arabia is based on the dying injunction of the Prophet, and this claim with regard to the Wardenship of the Holy Places rests on a series of injunctions to be found in the Quran and the Prophet's Traditions. If our loyalty has always been based on full and free recognition of our religious obligations and it cannot rest on any other basis then we have every right to insist that the Khilafat shall be preserved, that there shall be no Christian mandate over any part of the Island of Arabia, and that the Khalifa shall remain, as before the war, the Warden of the Holy Places. The Prime Minister claims that deference has been paid to Indian Muslim sentiments. But none has so far been paid even to Muslim

religious obligations, let alone Muslim sentiments. The only basis for the Prime Minister's claim seems to be that the Khalifa is to remain in Constantinople. But why is he to remain there? Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law and Sir Edward Carson alike stated clearly that there was no other alternative, and if Czarist Russia had not gone the way of all tyrannical autocracies, it would have been the Czar who would have reigned at Czargrad or Constantinople, and not the Sultan-Khalifa that would have been allowed to remain in Istambol out of deference to Muslim wishes. But that is not all. The Khalifa is to remain there, because there he can be dealt with as a hostage always living in fear of Allied guns. So much for "deference to Muslim wishes." So far, indeed, is this from the truth that we can safely contend that Indian Muslims have not even had a fair hearing. You suppress their papers and intern and imprison their leaders and even revered divines, and when this "frightfulness" has gagged the rest, you claim that you have heard them carefully and patiently. (Cheers.) Even now, we could not refer to the points raised by the Premier in his reply to us, for it would have lengthened the interview beyond the hour allotted to it, and would have cut into the night. But what is a night when questions are being solved that may mean years and decades of misery and trouble if they are not properly solved? What is a night after all, when today millions of people are passing sleepless nights waiting for one gleam of the rising sun of justice and equity after this horrible night of bloodshed and slaughter? (Cheers.)

But you will say, what of the Armenian massacres? Ladies and gentlemen, I do not in the least overlook them. How can we who hold a brief for Islam, the religion of peace and persuasion, overlook the horrors reported? But this question has a whole history behind it. Why is it that we never heard of these massacres in Armenia before the last quarter of the last century? Shall I tell you? It was because Czarist Russia was busy with massacre-mongering in other parts of Turkey—in the Balkans. It was only when the success of this great "camouflage" in the Balkans was achieved beyond the highest expectations of Czarist Russia, that

wanted a clear corridor from Petrograd to Peshawar, that Armenia was selected as the next stage on the journey. It is not sufficient to inquire into the fact of casualties. You must investigate when these "massacres" began, why they did not begin earlier, who was interested in their commencement, what intrigues went on inside and outside, whether peaceful subjects were slaughtered in cold blood or rebels dealt with as rebels are dealt with everywhere, whether an unarmed docile population was being exterminated by regular troops, or armed bodies of people were fighting among themselves on equal terms and a vendetta has been going on right to this day. Is it not true that the Armenians claimed representation in the Peace Conference because they were belligerents? Is it not even now being claimed for them that they assisted the Allies against their own Government and should be rewarded at its expense? Is it not true that these massacres are always heard of whenever any decision is about to be taken by the Allies with regard to territorial adjustment, and do they not occur just where capitalists see an excellent harbour and Imperialists find an excellent route by which military railway could traverse a difficult region? I have no desire to prejudge the issue. But we have claimed, and we claim now, that for the first time an inquiry should take place into the entire question, that an impartial internationalcommission should undertake it, and that the All-India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented on this Commission. Is that a demand for justice and truth or support of murderers? We challenge an open and impartial inquiry, for without such an inquiry you could not convince one Muslim and one Indian that you were not of the same mind today as you were when your Prime Minister, in proposing a gratuity for Lord Allenby, characterised his campaign as the last and most triumphant of Crusades in which Great Britain won what the entire chivalry ofEurope had failed to achieve in several centuries. It is not we who talk of Crusades but your Prime Minister. But even if the Turk is guilty of shedding innocent blood, is he the only criminal? What of the massacres in the Oasis of Tripoli? What of the massacres in the Balkans? What of the recent massacres in Smyrna? And what, if charity begins at home, of the massacre at Amritsar and the other Punjab atrocities? The Arab

blood that soaked the Tripoli sand and the Turkish bones still bleaching on the Balkan hilltops are crying in vain for vengeance. And yet Italy retains Tripoli, the Balkan Allies retain Macedonia, and M. Venizelos and his gallant Greeks are to be made masters of the richest Turkish province of Smyrna, while the Punjab is denied even self-government, and yet the Turk is to have his Empire dismembered because, forsooth, the Conscience of Europe and Christendom revolts at massacres! (Cheers.)

Then there is the Jewish claim. Well, here at least the Muslim and the Turk is on *terra firma*; for although it may not be easy for the world to decide whether in their dealings with Christians the Muslims have been more sinned against than sinning, it is far easier to institute a comparison between Christian toleration and Muslim toleration by taking up the crucial instance of the Jews in Christian and in Muslim lands. And Turkey is the only Power that has treated the Jews properly and humanely. If the Jews demand sovereignty—which they do not—their claim would be absurd, for they are the smallest minority in Palestine. But if they ask—as I understand they do—merely for a home, where they can cease to be reproached as wandering Jews, I feel sure their aspirations and natural longings, if they are kept within reasonable bounds, will be considered by the Turks in a reasonable spirit. We in India are today solving peacefully the problem of a composite nationality on lines of cultural federation with adequate protection of minorities. Is not that possible in Palestine and in so-called Armenia within the scheme of Ottoman sovereignty?

But there is one curiously significant fact to which I must invite your attention. The Turk is a cruel bigot and tyrant who does not know how to rule people of an alien faith and race, and they languish and perish because of his blighting touch. And yet the Greeks and Christians are still supposed by Mr. Lloyd George to form a majority in Thrace, and Christians, the so-called Armenians, are supposed to form a majority in several vilayets of so-called Armenia! And in all conscience they are prosperous enough in Smyrna and in Armenia, in Thrace and in Constantinople, while it is Turks and Kurds that languish. But now turn

for a moment from numbers and wealth to political capacity. The blighting touch of the Turk has, after many centuries, left the Greeks and the Armenians fit for absolute independence and even for rule over a majority of other communities; but in India we, who are the heirs of mighty Empires and mightier civilisations, have become unfit even for provincial autonomy and police duties after only a hundred and fifty years, and in some cases less than a century, of the blessings of British rule, and the Arab, who is fit to maintain an Empire from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic, because he is just extricating himself, under your august auspices, from the evils of Turkish rule, has become wholly unfit to regain his independence in Egypt after but a single generation of British occupation and a short and sweet dose of British Protectorate. (Loud cheers.) At this rate, if the world is to be made safe for democracy, and not merely for hypocrisy, then the sovereign remedy for all national ills is to subject the nations to the blasting tyranny of the Turks and incidentally remove from them the blessings of British rule. (Loud laughter.)

This, then, is the curious conclusion to which the British claim leads you. On the other hand, we only claim that our religious obligations should be respected, since it is on this respect that our loyalty to His Majesty has always been based; and that you do not dismember the Empire of the Khalifa, or, in other words, destroy the temporal power of Islam, but leave even to the Turk his territories and recognise his right to live.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, this is our claim, and we leave you to judge whether it is a claim for perpetuating a system of government by massacres or for justice and equity; whether we are disloyal people who threaten British rule or loyal people who have come only to warn the Government and the nation of the grave consequences of a bad peace—a peace that would be no peace, but would herald another and a longer, if not a bloodier, war, for it would be a war of conscience and of creed. We do not want to threaten, and we are of one mind with Col. Wedgwood whose speech in the Constantinople debate we had the privilege to hear when we went straight to

the House of Commons on our arrival in London. We do believe that more can be got out of Englishmen by persuasion than by threats. But when he asks us what can we threaten with, I do not agree with him. It is clear that we cannot threaten you with powerful engines of war. But we can threaten you and do threaten you with the might of truth and with a weapon that no shield can resist, with an unconquerable will not to yield to injustice and iniquity; with the will, in the last resort, to die. (Cheers.) I have addressed the British nation through this audience. To His Majesty the King-Emperor, too, I have a message to deliver through you. And it is in the form of a question. Can he any longer rely on the allegiance of his Indian and Muslim subjects if they betray the allegiance they owe to a higher King, the King of Kings? (Loud cheers.) And would he like to rule over a nation of slaves and cowards such as we would be if we submitted to the kind of peace that is about to be concluded or to rule over men and women who honoured their conscience as their King and brought to his august Throne the unbought submission of a free nation? (Loud cheers.)

Mr. Syed Hossain: I want to put this problem of Turkey, which is really the problem of the Khilafat, not from the direction of Constantinople, but Calcutta. The fact is that the Sultan of Turkey (besides being the temporal head of the Turkish Empire) happens also to be the Khalifa of the Islamic world. This may be an unfortunate responsibility. It may be that the claims of the Ottoman Sultans to the Khilafat may not be so satisfactory as Professor Margoliouth and others like him would like. I am prepared to concede all those academic difficulties. The more important thing is that more than seventy-five millions in British India today recognise the Sultan of Turkey as their Khalifa. We are up against realities; we have neither the time nor the inclination for academic discussions. If what I have stated is the case, how can the Muslims be expected to continue loyal to the British Crown if they see England a party to the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, which involves the disintegration of the Khilafat? (Cheers.)

Camouflage is a phrase that has come into universal popularity with the war, but its popularity has not ended with the war, and even now when we are supposed to be in the throes of the aftermath of the war, we find camouflage installed in the most exalted quarters—in Downing Street and elsewhere. But we have got past the stages of political claptrap. We have not come here as the agents of a political agitation. This is not a political affair at all. It is a religious question which goes deep down into Muslim society and Muslim life throughout the world, and we as Muslims are not prepared to let the Khilafat go down unmourned, unhonoured and unsung. (Cheers.) It is not very much we can do in the ordinary sense. It has been asked: "What can the Indian Muslims do?" They are a disarmed population like the rest of their compatriots in India, and it is both very easy and cheap to put questions of that kind. Let me ask, supposing we can do nothing in the way of retaliation, even if we wanted to, which we do not, is that the kind of foundation on which you propose to build up your great British Commonwealth—that the whole sanction of my British allegiance is that I can do nothing? (Loud cheers.) Have the statesmen of Europe, like the Bourbons of old, learned nothing and forgotten nothing from the Armageddon? Is that the last answer we can get from responsible Ministers and statesmen in this country?

Mr. Lloyd George is in Downing Street today, but he may not be there to-morrow. The British Empire, I am glad to say, is independent of Mr. Lloyd George's tenure of 10, Downing Street. The British Empire has to be continued by the people, and it is before the great British people that we lay our question of conscience. It is not a question of political bargaining. It is not a question of sentimental consideration for the Turk or the Indian. It is keeping alive the faith of Islam, which we are not prepared to let die. (Cheers.)

As you are aware we went to see Mr. Lloyd George the other day. The whole Muslim case was presented to him with "very great lucidity and moderation." Unhappily, neither the lucidity nor the moderation with which he credited us was reflected in his reply. We are concerned only to advance one

ground and that is that Turkey cannot be torn into fragments like Germany and Austria, because the day you tear the Empire of the Khilafat to fragments you outrage the feelings of seventy-five millions of your own people. That is where the principle of self-determination comes in. (Cheers.) I do not know how this controversy may have to be fought out in later stages. Certainly, so far as Mr. Lloyd George's reply is concerned it offers no way out. I want to remain a loyal subject of the British Crown, but I can only do so on this basis, that I shall have, as heretofore, complete religious freedom, that I shall be allowed to call my soul my own. (Cheers.)

JUSTICE TO ISLAM AND TURKEY

A speech delivered at a meeting held at Kingsway Hall, London, in connection with the Indian Khilafat Delegation, on Thursday, the 22nd of April, 1920, with Mr. George Lansbury in the chair.

III

JUSTICE TO ISLAM AND TURKEY

THE resolution that I have the honour to place before you this evening is :

That this meeting urges upon the Government the necessity for taking into serious consideration, in the Turkish settlement, the religious obligations of the Muslims (who in India alone number some 70 million citizens of the British Empire) and the national sentiment of United India.

Before I say anything about the claims that we have come to present, not only to the British and Allied Governments, but to the nations of Europe and America, I should like to make one point clear. And it is this—that we are not Turks. Whether the Turks be good people or bad people, whether they are gentle and humane, as all who have known them say, or murderers of women and children and massacrers, as has been alleged fairly frequently, they are, technically at any rate, the King's enemies. But we are British Indians, fellow-citizens of yours and as good subjects as you are of the King-Emperor. When the Turks come they will present a case to the Allies. I hope they will present the case well,and I hope they will succeed in presenting their case. But the case we have got to present is not the case of aliens or enemies, but the case of members of this Empire. I am glad that in the resolution the word "citizen" is used. To tell you the truth, I have been quite content to call myself a subject—(Mr. Lansbury and the audience: "No, a citizen"). However, I present the case today from the emimence of British citizenship, which I can only feel just a little bit when I am here, and not at all in my own country, where I can be interned or imprisoned without charge or trial, and nobody any the wiser,

and where it is rather difficult for me to remember that I am as much a citizen as Mr. Lansbury—(laughter and cheers). For if he is sent to prison, for which I am sure he has qualified himself —(loud laughter)—the people would soon know the reason why by a few questions asked in the House of Commons—one of our friends here (Colonel Wedgwood) would probably have an all-night sitting—and even if the House of Commons proved as impotent as it sometimes is in these democratic days of Coalitions and Coupons—(laughter)—the good people of the Labour Party would see to it that by some sort of action, direct or indirect, I can't tell which—(laughter)—the right of British Citizenship was not denied to Mr. Lansbury.

Now, what is our case? We are told in the "Times" and other newspapers that the Muslims of India must not dictate the foreign policy of the British Government. Well, ladies and gentlemen, in our wildest dreams it certainly did not occur to us to dictate the foreign policy of the British Government. I wish we could even dictate the internal policy of the Government in connection with India. (Laughter.) If this is an Empire (I should like to call it a Commonwealth) in which we are equal partners, as we are very often told we are, and it was certainly demanded of us to be equal partners when sacrifices had got to be made—and at that time we in India neither stinted money nor men—well, then, when the war is over, when the captains and the kings have departed—particularly the kings, for only one or two are now left—(laughter)—when poor, common people, no better than us Indians and people of that sort, very common people, not autocrats and aristocrats, but mere democrats, have assembled to make peace—(laughter)—then I want to know what position I, whose people have given their men and money, have in the making of the peace. (Cheers.) If you, ladies and gentlemen, who are of British birth and Christian faith, do not like your policy to be dictated to you by black heathens of the East, then I say we also do not want the foreign policy of *our* Empire to be dictated to us by a tiny fraction of forty-five millions of people of British birth and Christian faith. (Cheers.)

If you desire to have a Commonwealth, well and good. If

you want the old-fashioned Empire, well and good, though not so well and good; but in any case it is not little Englanders who call themselves Imperialists that are going to lay down the policy of the British Empire. (Cheers.) We, who number three hundred and fifteen millions in an Empire of four hundred and fifteen millions, should, I say, have some kind of voice, if not the preponderating voice, in the making of peace, though we had none in the making of a war which, nevertheless, we were called upon to wage. (Cheers.)

Apart from that consideration there is another. In this it is not a question of citizenship, but purely a question of subjection, but of a subjection that is and has always been strictlyconditional. When the Queen of England, in the days of my grandfather, took into her hands the reins of office of India, and began to rule over the territories of the East India Company, a trading company which had become a sovereign power entirely against its will, after passing numerouss elf-denying ordinances—(laughter)—well, when the reins of Government in these territories passed into the hands of the Queen, a proclamation was issued that did her credit and did your people credit. It was a noble one and we have always believed in it. The most important thing that that document contained was that no matter what changes should take place, one thing would remain unchanged—our religious obligations would be respected. Ladies and gentlemen, we have given you whatever you needed, we were certainly not "picy" and never stinted money. In fact we have been spendthrifts perhaps, and squandered what wealth was left to us after having squandered away an Empire; but whatever we may or may not have thrown away, one thing was dear to us and that was faith—(cheers)—and it was understood that it was to be in all circumstances respected by the British. You may have had your Catholic disabilities and your Jewish disabilities. But we were assured that within the Indian Empire you had removed the disabilities of the Indians. They could claim to have free consciences, and it was clearly on the basis that our faith would be entirely respected that we consented to accept the rule of the Queen.

It may have been that we were too powerless at the time to

have stopped you from exercising religious tyranny over the country, you with your powerful guns, ships and weapons of destruction : it may have been that we would have been entirely powerless to stop you even if you had chosen not to respect our faith ; but whatever the situation, it is a fact that in the name of Great Britain the Queen gave us the charter of our religious liberties, and gave us the pledge that our religious obligations would be entirely respected. That was the price of our allegiance to the Queen of Great Britain. Today, when the Muslims are called upon to disregard their religious obligations, it is clearly because of that charter that Indians have a right to say "this shall not be." (Cheers.) They have to go, not only to His Majesty, the successor of Queen Victoria, not only to 10, Downing Street, where Mr. Lloyd George now lives, and hopes to live for ever and ever, they will have to go to every British man and woman who has drawn the least benefit from British rule over India, and tell them that they cannot possibly ask them to disregard their religious obligations without the most palpable breach of faith with more than three hundred millions of people. (Loud cheers.)

If the religious claims of the Indian Muslims, which were to them solemn obligations, were now to be ignored, the pledge contained in the noble Proclamation of 1858 would be broken. You may, if you choose, question our claims and examine whether the preservation of the Khilafat, with adequate temporal power for the defence of the faith, and the maintenance of exclusive Muslim control over Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, are duties imposed by Islam on every Muslim or not. But once they are acknowledged to be so, as they must be, then you cannot thereafter say we must dismember the Khilafat and demand a mandate in Mesopotamia and still expect from us the same loyal allegiance. This cannot and shall not be. (Cheers.)

In the House of Commons the hero of Paisley, fresh from his triumph, in the very first debate that he could start on the subject after his election, talked of the connection of the Khilafat and Constantinople as being a fairly modern matter, and maintained that the Sultan as Khalifa has not been there

more than four hundred years. Well, that is still 300 years longer than the rule of English kings and queens in India, but I will come to that by and by. Well, Mr. Asquith wanted to "Vaticanise" the Khalifa. But the Khalifa, as even Mr. Lloyd George could now tell him, was not the Pope, and the moment he would consent to be "Vaticanised," he would cease to be the Khalifa. He was the Commander of the Faithful, the President of our Theocratic Commonwealth, the Leader of all Muslims in peace and war though he could neither claim to be infallible like the Pope, nor could he in all circumstances exercise unquestioned authority, for Allah was the only Sovereign, and in case of dispute Muslims were bound to refer back to the Holy Quran and to the Traditions of the Prophet whose successor the Khalifa is.

But whatever he could or could not do, the Khalifa was certainly not a pious old gentleman, whose only function in life was to mumble his prayers and repeat his beads as Mr. Asquith clearly seems to think. If such is the ignorance of Mr. Asquith with regard to such fundamental doctrines of Islam, even after having been enlightened by our Delegation, then is it not a shame and a disgrace to one who has once been, and apparently still dreams of being once more, the Prime Minister of the Imperial Government of Great Britain ? (Laughter.)

Having claimed to shape the destinies of three or four hundred million Indians, including over 70 million Muslims, if this is the extent of their knowledge, then I say it is a shame and a disgrace. (Cheers.) Mr. Asquith said, no doubt humorously, that in these days even if a Khalifa goes to war he cannot hope to go to war with limited liabilities. Well, I will say this to him, that even in this twentieth century we are a very backward people in India, and if you will go to war with the Khalifa in order to oust him from the seat of the Khilafat, if you go to war with him in order to dismember his Empire, and if you go to war with him in order to step into the sanctuaries of our faith, because there is oil in Mosul, if you go to war with him because the sanctity of the Holy Land of Islam must be violated by exploiters demanding a mandate in Mesopotamia, no doubt

in the Sacred name of Self-Determination spelt with three letters, O—I—L—(laughter)—then even in these days you will have to go to war, I am afraid, with very limited assets indeed. (Loud cheers.)

It is sometimes said, "The Turks waged war against us; we fought them and we have defeated them, now we are going to treat them as defeated people. We have beaten the Turks and must deal with them as we wish." This argument is all very fine, but who is "We"? Who fought, and who won the war? Who went to war in Mesopotamia? Who went to war in the Holy Land? India won Baghdad, and India and Muslims won the Holy Land. According to Mr. Lloyd George, the Allies are not dealing with the Turks differently from other defeated people. We are told there is nothing of the Christian and the Crusading spirit in this matter. And yet, when proposing a gratuity for Lord Allenby he said: "The name of General Allenby will be ever renowned as that of the brilliant Commander who fought and won the last and most triumphant of the Crusades. It was his good fortune by his skill to bring to a glorious end an enterprise which absorbed the chivalry of Europe for centuries. We forget now that the military strength of Europe was concentrated for generations upon this purpose in vain, and a British Army under the command of General Allenby achieved it finally." So there was after all something of the crusading spirit somewhere when General Allenby, in the words of Mr. Lloyd George himself, "won the last and most triumphant of the crusades." However, at the very time Lord Allenby was saying that two-thirds of his army in this crusade was composed of Muslims; a wonderful crusade, in which the Crescent was fighting the battle of the Cross. But, anyhow, were not the co-religionists and compatriots of these strange Crusaders who repudiated the Cross and yet fought the Crescent, entitled to demand that the religious obligations of the Muslims and the overwhelming national sentiment of India should be considered in the Turkish settlement?

Whatever the Indian soldiers have done, this I will say about them—I have seen them; we had always avoided con-

tact with them in deference to official susceptibilities—but when we came out of gaol these people have rushed to us like the rest of their countrymen; they have kissed our hands, embraced us, shown to us in an unmistakble manner that if you demanded from them, conscripted soldiers as they almost were, that they should go against their own religious obligations, they have unmistakably shown to us that that day you will be using a weapon which will break in your hands. (Cheers.)

Therefore, although I do not threaten, although we have not come here to threaten you, it ought to be made clear to you that the situation is now different. Today it is not only the Muslims who feel like this, but the Hindus, and even the Sikhs—after Amritsar. (Cheers.) India today is one and united. (Cheers.) That is why in our resolution we have asked the Government to show respect not only for Muslim obligations, but also for the national sentiment of United India. How is this sentiment expressing itself? On the 17th October last the Muslims observed the Khilafat Day, a day on which the Muslims suspended business and fasted and prayed, and many Hindus joined them. Now on the 19th March, precisely the day that we were being received in 10, Downing Street by Mr. Lloyd George, from one end of India to another there was a total suspension of business, in which not only Muslims and Hindus and Sikhs, but Parsees and others also participated. In order to realise what this suspension of business means, I will ask you not to think of a railway strike, nor even a general strike in England or in Germany; you have got to think of the total suspension of business throughout the Continent of Europe. (Cheers.) Yet, primitive as some of our people are, very impulsive as they seem to be, in spite of this universal demonstration, there was no violence. (Cheers.) And this in spite of the existence of men who provoke violence. Yes, there is a class of people that excites violence. We have known people in India who are agents of violence, because if violence is provoked, in its early stages it might be crushed, and that might be used as an argument for "not making concessions to rebels." That is the old vicious circle in which people who want to keep power

in their own hands try that the world should move. Oppression provokes disturbances and disturbances are used for perpetuating oppression and refusing reforms. After reading a good deal of the history of England at Oxford, I am not quite sure that three quarters of your constitution is not based on force or a show of force in the background. When King John gave the Magna Carta to the people of England, the great charter of your liberties, and I hope of ours too, in spite of some recent decisions of the Privy Council—(cheers)—he did not do it absolutely out of love for the British people. (Laughter.) Still less, when King Charles forfeited his head, he did not sign his death-warrant because he thought the best thing for him to do was to leave the world. (Laughter.) The same sort of thing may be said of the conditions which prevailed in the days of King Charles the Second, who did not want to go on his travels again, and of James the Second, who did apparently want to go. (Laughter.) In all these reforms, one after another, you always find this, that the people's liberties had to be either purchased when kings were in need of money for their wars or their amours—(laughter)—or there was force, or show of force, in the background. We in India, however, do not threaten you with force.

We are being led by a man who believes in Soul-force. If throughout the world today there is anyone who tries to live up to the Sermon on the Mount—that sermon which is often overrated but at the same time always forgotten in the shaping of your foreign policy—if any man tries to live up to that sermon it is Mahatma Gandhi. (Loud cheers.) He is not a Muslim. He is a Hindu of Hindus. Today he is leading the entire continent of India because he has realised that in this matter the Muslims are not carrying on a "fictitious" and a "factitious" agitation, and he has carefully ascertained that they cannot possibly "moderate" the claims that they have put forward without being absolutely false to all the convictions that they have cherished for centuries. Time after time he had pressed us for an irreducible minimum of our claims. He has at last himself drawn up a manifesto, which we have brought with us as the mandate of the

Indian Delegation. The claim put forward is a simple claim. It says that it is one of the fundamental doctrines of Islam, absolutely unalterable, that there should always be a Khalifa, and that the Khalifa should have temporal power at all times adequate for the defence of the Faith, and that is the measure of the irreducible minimum of temporal power.

Whatever you like to think about temporal power, I am convinced, and I think I can convince you easily enough, that when you have people like Lord Bryce who want to use the argument of the "Big Stick," you will be bound to meet the Muslim demand for temporal power for the Khalifa. (Cheers.) If, however, there is complete disarmament in Europe, the first person who will desire to bring his arms to the scrap-heap, or to turn them into ploughshares, will be the Muslim Khalifa himself. (Loud cheers.)

The second claim is that the local centre of our Faith, the land known as the Island of Arabia, should be free from non-Islamic control in any shape or form. Arabia to the European geographer is a peninsula bounded only on three sides by water; but to the Islamic religion it has always been an island. You will understand this when I tell you that it is surrounded on one side by the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, on another side by the Indian Ocean, on the third side by the Persian Gulf, and on the fourth by the waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris; and on his death-bed our Prophet gave an injunction, binding on all sections of Muslims, that in that region no kind of non-Muslim control should be allowed.

But even if you disregard our religious requirements, what about your own political principles? We have heard a great deal of the principle of self-determination, and now that we have seen some applications of this principle, we find that it has about as many interpretations as love or religion. (Laughter.) There is one interpretation when the principle is applied to Ireland; on this you are all well-informed, and I shall not waste your time. There is another interpretation of self-determination for Montenegro, when it is assured it is not good to be a cock's head when you can be a bull's tail. (Laughter.) In spite of Montenegro's desire

for independence, she is assured that it is better in her own interest to be part of a larger unit. When we ask that the Arabs should not be forced to get out of the larger unit we are told by Mr. Lloyd George: "Is the sacred principle of self-determination not to be applied to an Arab simply because he is a Muslim?" But surely the last interpretation of self-determination is the best of all. We never knew that that large mouthful of a word, self-determination, could be spelt with three letters: O—I—L. (Laughter.) This is the latest interpretation of self-determination. But whatever Mr. Lloyd George may say, the people of Mesopotamia, as well as those of Syria and Palestine, have clearly determined that they will have no mandates and no protectorates. (Cheers.)

Then we come to Constantinople, which has been very generously spared to the Khalifa, out of deference to Muslim wishes or to French wishes, I cannot tell which. (Laughter.)

But did not Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law, and Sir Edward Carson tell us that this had to be since there was no other alternative, and the late lamented and always lamentable Tsarist autocracy was no more? (Laughter.) And is it not because Mr. Lloyd George desires to keep the head of the Khalifa in chancery? The Khalifa is to remain a hostage in the hands of the Powers, and we are to express our gratitude for it. This is an outrage which Islam will never tolerate. (Cheers.) The Straits are to be taken out of Turkish control, and British guns are always to be trained on the Khalifa's palace. There was a time when Great Britain and France went to war with Russia on the side of Turkey, because Russia wanted the Straits to be open to her battle-fleet. Today there is no Russian battle-fleet, so you find that the Straits are to be opened and to be guarded by Russia's recent Allies, because the Turks "must not be able to slam the door in our face." Why should they not? Do you not slam the door in the face of all comers in the harbour of Dover? The present demand is just as though you were going to be asked to open the Yarmouth harbour to the German ships. What is going to happen is this: that the Straits of Dardanelles and Bosphorus will once more be closed to Russia, but this time

by her Allies the British. The whole past history of this Straits business has been this: the Russian Black Sea fleet wanted to come out into the Mediterranean, and the Turks were asked to keep the door slammed in everybody's face, because the route to India should not be endangered. Today it is not the Russian Black Sea fleet that wants to come out into the Mediterranean—it is the fleet of another Power that wants to get into the Black Sea to outflank Soviet Russia and to control the oil that comes from Baku to Batoum. Numerous little States, such as Azarbaijan, formerly parts of the Russian Empire, have been formed now, to guard for the Allied Powers the oil at Baku. Whether it is oil, whether it is Bolshevism, that suggests this policy—whatever it is, the Muslims cannot permit that their Khalifa is to remain as a hostage. They claim that it is part of their Faith that the Khilafat should exist as an independent sovereignty, and its Empire should not be dismembered any further after the very great spoliation that had already taken place after the Balkan War. After that large spoliation, the Khalifa's Empire has really been reduced to such small proportions that they cannot allow the least little bit of Khilafat territory to be taken away from the Khalifa, and they must insist that in the Holy Lands, even in spite of oil, they would not have a British Protectorate, or French or American mandate.

They do not rule out political changes, and they say that if the Arabs genuinely desire self-government they should have it. If the Jews desire it they should have it. If the claim of the Jews is not for political sovereignty, but for economic freedom or for a cultural federation, it can be gladly recognised. Lastly, if the Armenians in so-called Armenia want self-government they should have self-government; but they should not, being in a minority, be allowed to rule over the Muslim majority.

People in this country talk so much of the Armenian "massacres." I crossed over to France the other day, and although I talked with various classes of people, they never once mentioned to me those blessed words: "Armenian massacres." It seems to me that the only people in love with the massacres are the British. (Laughter.) What do we ask? I do not treat

the matter lightly. It is not a matter for jokes. (Cheers.) A massacre is a massacre and whoever indulges in it is a criminal, and a criminal should be punished. (Cheers.) We, the Muslims of India, do not care this much for the Turkish Empire, as such. We care for Islam. (Cheers.) If the name of Islam is to be besmirched in this manner, then we want you to go to the spot and hold a careful enquiry. Mr. Lloyd George was asked to publish the Inter-Allied Commission's report about the massacres undoubtedly indulged in by Greek soldiers in Smyrna. They had no right to be there. Yet in the name of yourself and your Allies these people went there, according to the report of this Inter-Allied Commission, in the spirit of conquerors and crusaders, and perpetrated massacres and outrages of every sort. Nothing was published because Mr. Lloyd George said that the Greeks had not been heard in their defence, and even a Christian should not be punished before he is tried and found guilty. I do not know why he used that word "even," but I can equally well say even a Muslim should be tried before he is punished. (Cheers.) There have been allegations against the Turks for a long time because the Tzars of Russia were anxious to make a corridor through Europe and Asia from Petrograd to Peshawar (cheers), and after the success of this massacre "stunt" in the Balkans and the liberation of Bulgaria, they tried the same sort of intrigue in Armenia. Nathing pleased the Russians so much as a massacre. Russia has gone the way of all tyrannical autocracies (cheers), but it has left this legacy of massacres behind. (Cheers.)

What do Muslims ask ? They say : "Have an International Commission ! Allow the Muslims of India and Hindus to be represented on that Commission, and go into the whole question of massacres before the war, during the war, and now. If the Turks are found guilty they should be punished. But if they are to be punished, equal punishment should be meted out to those who caused the sands of Tripoli to be soaked with Arab blood." (Cheers) We demand that in the Balkans—the bones of Turks are still bleaching today on Balkan heights (cheers)—we demand that the people who butchered women and children there in cold blood after unnameable outrages, should be punished. And we

Indians have a right to demand that not only should it be the Italians and the Bulgarians and the Greeks, but even the British, the O'Dwyers and the Dyers who have dyed their hands with gore (shame) and fired on innocent crowds assembled for lawful purposes (shame) on April 13 last year, we demand that they too should be punished. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

But if you, Englishmen and women, are not prepared to do justice by your own people, then I say you have no right to talk of doing justice by the Turks, and to deal with this business of massarces. If you will use force to compel us to submit to a peace that contravenes Islamic religious requirements, and blood is shed for blood, then the guilt of blood will be yours, because you are prepared to use force, but you are not prepared to do justice to the Muslims. (Cheers.)

This is what we have come to ask. I tell you this, we have not come to threaten, and we do not threaten you. My friend Mr. Wedgwood, in the House of Commons, said, "You can get more out of English people by persuasion than by threats," and I believe him. But he says, "What can you threaten us with?" Well, that is the worst part of the whole business. (Cheers.) There is nothing at all after less than a hundred years of British rule that we can threaten you with. (Cheers.) It is true, as Colonel Wedgwood asked, what can we threaten you with? though the measure of our impotence, in spite of our righteous wrath today, is also the measure of the success of your crushing rule achieved in no more than a century. (Cheers.) But having reduced us to this state of impotence, I ask you to consider this. If we want to threaten you we obviously cannot threaten you with Howitzers and Dreadnoughts and Aeroplanes and Tanks; but we possess a thing that is unconquerable; our determination to die true to our Faith. (Cheers.) Money is being poured into the Fund for the Khilafat. But every Muslim who pays is told that this is not money; it is only a draft on the life of every subscriber. (Cheers.) We do not threaten to kill you; but we do threaten you with your undying determination to die kings of our consciences and masters of our souls. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

DENUNCIATION OF THE TURKISH TREATY

Report of a speech delivered before the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Labour Party at Scarborough, England, on 2nd July, 1920.

IV

DENUNCIATION OF THE TURKISH TREATY

THE Labour Party's twentieth annual Conference was held from the 22nd to 25th June at Scarborough. Indians in England tried to arrange, if possible, for a hearing being accorded to their Delegation. After great efforts on the 21st, the Assistant Secretary officiating for the Right Hon. Mr. Arthur Henderson asked the Delegation to submit their request to the Standing Orders Committee in charge of the preparation of the programme. The Delegation accordingly explained the nature of the interest of the Muslims and the Indian nation with the Turkish settlement and gave a short history of the Khilafat Movement reminding the Committee that the matter was obviously of greatest urgency as in a few days' time the issue of peace or war on the East would be decided and concluded, that the recent manifestations of the Indian feeling were such a grave portent of evil which was happily still avoidable, that the Delegation must earnestly seek from the Conference a hearing on the earliest possible occasion. Nevertheless the Advisory Committee decided against the Delegation's request on the ground of a heavy programme already difficult to finish within time. Thereupon the Delegation, although much discouraged, canvassed in influential labour circles approaching the Right Hon. J R. Clynes, Mr. Neil Maclean, M.P., Mr. George Lansbury, and finally appealed to the Chairman of the Conference. Mr. Hutchinson of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers and the Labour Executive and Mr. George Lansbury were then asked by the Chairman to interview the Standing Orders Committee and the Delegation finally succeeded in getting five minutes allotted to Mohamed Ali for a statement.

In the course of his speech Mohamed Ali, while thanking the

Chairman and the Committee and the distinguished Labour leaders who had interceded playfully remarked that he represented the case of a nation numbering 315 millions and had come 7,000 miles land and sea to represent it and it was an interesting problem, which would probably take more than the allotted five minutes to solve what fraction of a second per mile the Delegation had succeeded in getting allotted to it even by the Labour Party. This pointed thrust went home and the 1,200 Labour delegates representing several millions of organised workmen during Mohamed Ali's speech several times shouted "Go on." "Let him go on," when the Chairman's bell announced the time was up. The result was that he spoke for fifteen instead of the allotted 5 minutes.

* * *

Mr. Mohamed Ali said he had remarked both at the Peace Congress at Glasgow and the Labour Conference at Scarborough that we desired peace and wanted the impossible and iniquitous peace treaties to be revised But although Germany, Russia, Hungary, even Bulgaria were mentioned repeatedly never once was Turkey mentioned. Yet there was a treaty neither signed nor ratified and there was still time for all desirous of peace or justice to demand from the Allied Governments the withdrawal of by far the most infamous treaty ever drafted and the substitution of something that would be just and could consequently ensure peace. (Cheers.)

The world was weary of war, even England was weary of war, at least British Labour was weary of war. (Cheers.) Yet the world was being rushed into another war that would be more bitter and much longer and more widespread than the last war, because it would be a war of creeds and consciences. In a few days' time the issue of peace or war would be decided one way or the other. If Labour desired peace it should speak out now. (Cheers.) All sorts of appeals were made for Russia, Germany, Hungary, appeals for commercial intercourse, continuance of existence as Independent Powers, relief of starving children, but had Labour realised that Turkey needed all these just as much as any other power ?

At least there were starving children in Turkey too. (Cheers.) Though India alone was ready to relieve their sufferings if only the Government would allow the Indian Relief Mission passports to proceed thither yet perhaps nobody spoke of Turkey because they thought the Turk was unspeakable! Yet only one generation ago a party of British gentlemen characterised the Turk the only gentleman in Eastern Europe. Once more to-day the British Government was dominated by that party of gentlemen but these gentlemen had now forsaken "the only gentleman in Eastern Europe."

The speaker when appealing for justice for the Turk to the Labour Conference did not desire to lay greater stress on the fact that the Turk was a gentleman, but he could, he hoped, confidently appeal for justice to Labour on the ground that the Turk was at least a man (cheers) and those like his friend Colonel Wedgwood who had fought against him, would acknowledge as he had acknowledged that the Turk was not only a man but a brave man and a noble man. (Cheers.) He could not understand how such a clean fighter and humane person could all of a sudden, without reason, without provocation, perpetrate cold-blooded massacres and slaughter of women and children. If such was still the belief of British Labour why not hold the first impartial international enquiry with Indian peoples fully represented? (Cheers.)

The Turks' case was not popular in England at the present moment, but in defending the Turk before a Labour audience he had his consolation, that he could say Labour's case itself was none too popular. (Laughter.) Behind the recent bitterness against the Turk arising out of the war were ancient prejudices centuries old, but not older than the prejudice against Labour itself. (Cheers.) The same class often abused the Turk as abused Labour and it was some satisfaction to him that centuries ago when the Turk first became unspeakable they, the Labourites, were villains. (Loud laughter.) However, he had not come to present the Turks' case, but his own case as a Muslim and an Indian. (Cheers.)

His case was that the Turkish Treaty outraged the Muslim

conscience, disregarded the principles of justice and humanity and particularly the principles of self-determination and violated pledges deliberately and repeatedly given to the Muslims of India. Naturally the question of Turkish settlement had its chief importance for the Muslims of India on account of religious obligations towards the Khilafat which could not be disregarded except at the peril of the loss of Muslim allegiance, but when he decided to appeal to British Labour, the speaker said, he was warned not to speak about religions because he was told Labour was irreligious. (Laughter.) It was not so much a reproach to Labour as to the particular kind of religion presented to Labour. (Cheers.) It was the fault of that religion and of the Church which presented it if religion could not continue its grip on the hearts and minds of Labour. (Cheers.)

He, at any rate, came to speak for religion that recognised no geographical, ethnological, or political divisions as barriers to the widest human sympathies and the freest human intercourse. (Cheers.) Witness the fact that the Indian Delegation, not one member of which had any drop of Turkish blood in his veins or had ever been to Turkey or knew one word of the Turkish language, had travelled 7,000 miles to demand a just and equitable Turkish settlement. (Cheers.) He represented a faith intolerant to narrow nationalism. (Cheers.) His was a faith that was supernational. (Cheers.) It had no church, no clergy. (Cheers.) It refused to be a religion only for Sundays and Sabbaths for churches, temples and synagogues. (Cheers.) It was a work-a-day faith (cheers) and as much meant for the market place as for the Mosque. (Cheers.) That is why it still retained its grip upon the masses. (Cheers.) It recognised wage-earners as a friend of God (cheers) and regarded poverty as a matter of pride. (Cheers.)

The Indian Muslims were told their religion would be tolerated, but it must not interfere with our politics. He wished some religion did interfere with the present Parliament and British politics. (Laughter.) True religion guided man in every concern of life. (Cheers.) It taught him how to live and how to die and the speaker said his faith refused to be confined inside the Mosque. (Cheers.) It would go to their Parliaments, it would

go to their public houses, it would go to their stock exchanges, it would go to their shops where they were being cheated. (Cheers.) That was the kind of faith that could keep its hold on labour and it was for respect and tolerance for such a faith that the Delegation had come to plead. (Cheers.)

Now, this infamous Treaty, said the speaker, disregarded their religious obligation in seeking to dismember the Empire, the Khilafat and demanding the acceptance of non-Muslim mandates in the Holy Land of Islam. The Muslims could not allow the Khilafat to be dismembered. The Turkish Treaty contained clause after clause that made it unacceptable to them. When the Delegation had protested, the Prime Minister replied: "The Turks fought against us, we beat them, we are going to punish them." But Mr. Lloyd George forgot it was Indian soldiers who beat the Turks (cheers) and if Indian Muslims were good enough for partnership in making war they should be equally good enough for partnership for making peace. (Loud cheers.) At any rate, this kind of trick could not dupe India twice. (Cheers.) The Muslims did not ask for the retention of temporary power for the Muslim Pope. The Khalifa was not even a priest, but the head of their federal republic and it was merely an accident and an unfortunate accident that he happened to be a king.

After referring to the literature on the subject of their religious responsibilities made available at the bookstall in the Conference Hall, the speaker said it should suffice for British Labour to know that their Hindu compatriots led by Mr. Gandhi, that true Christian who not only preached but practised the Sermon on the Mount (cheers) had after careful cross-examination satisfied themselves that their religious responsibilities were old and genuine. It was then that 250 millions of their compatriots of other faiths had said since this question was one of such vital concern to 70 millions of Indians who happen to be Muslims, it could not be a matter of indifference to them (cheers) and to-day the Delegation was there to represent the united sentiment and view of national India. (Cheers.)

But there were pledges given in their name which the British

could not disregard. The earliest of these pledges was given in 1858 when the British nation took over the task of governing India from the East India Company and had ever since formed the basis and condition precedent of India's loyalty. It was only fair that if the British no longer respected their religious obligation, they should be released from their allegiance to which they had been true for a century and a half in spite of much injustice and occasional tyranny. (Cheers.) Another pledge was given in 1914 at the outbreak of the war with Turkey when the Allied Governments were desirous of enlisting the support of the Muslim people and soldiery and were anxious in the words of the Government Proclamation that "there should be no misunderstanding on the part of His Majesty's most loyal Muslim subjects." That pledge had been broken both in letter and spirit, the Holy Places had not been immune from attack and molestation and were now one and all British occupations direct or otherwise and although it was said that the War would involve no religious question, the Treaty now demanded from Turkey, the renunciation of Khilafat jurisdiction and acceptance of mandates in Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia is in direct contravention of the Prophet's death-bed injunctions.

The speaker ironically said the Proclamation had caused the greatest of misunderstanding: a second time on the part of His Majesty's most loyal Muslim subjects after this contemplated betrayal, if His Majesty still had any loyal Muslim subjects, or in fact, any Muslim subjects at all for already the Muslims had announced their determination to cut off all connection if the Treaty did not conform to the Muslim Law.

Everybody had heard of the incident of the "May-Flower" which had given birth to the great American nation, now so much sought after but what was the small band of Pilgrim Fathers that left the English shores, compared to the volume of emigration of Indian Muslims to-day? Six weeks ago more than 1,300 had already migrated to Afghanistan whose Ameer was openly giving them an asylum. Already, as many as 25,000 from only one part of a single province of India had wired to the Governor of Bombay asking what formalities they were required to com-

ply with as they desired to walk out of the British Empire. There could be no mistaking the significance of this movement. The last of the pledges to which the speaker referred was that given on 5th January, 1918, at a most cirtical moment during the war when according to so recent a statement of the Prime Minister as his speech in the course of the Constantinople debate in the House of Commons on 6th February, the Government was "making special efforts in India to secure recruits," and the Muslim population of India who "were disturbed and wanted an assurance." This covered not only Constantinople, but Thrace and Smyrna, both predominantly Muslim as all statistics proved. But in the case of Turk the principle of self-determination, the one outstanding product of the political evolution during the last five or six years, was disregarded and Muslim majorities were handed over to the tender mercies of Venizelos, that Jingo Imperialist of Crete. (Cheers.) The speaker referred to the statistics of population and property and said that if instead of counting heads, they resorted once more to the old practice of cutting heads let them do it but he asked Labour not to be deluded once more by the Allied Governments. M. Venizelos assured them to-day he could enforce the infamous Treaty without the cost of one drop of British money. If Greece succeeded it was all right, though even then it would be unrighteous for British Labour to consent and acquiesce (cheers) but what if Greece were beaten as he hoped and believed she would be? (Cheers.)

Then appeals would be made to British prestige, that heathen fetish worshipped by Imperialism and capital. (Cheers.) Already their passions were being excited against the Turks and it was said the troops from the Punjab, poor, downtrodden, massacred Punjab (cheers), were treacherously fired upon by the Turks and gallant Gordons had been sent to rescue but this was only the beginning.

One speaker had said they had been fooled by the Government in the last War but they were not going to be made fools of the second time but, said Mohamed Ali, amidst cheers, he was not sure of that as things stood at present. Government

knew a thing or two in the art of fooling people and could always make fools of them in spite of themselves (cheers), but he would like to warn them. If the Allies would go to the succour of vanquished Greece as they were bound to do to prevent a reversal of the result of the war of Greek liberation, as the Allied Governments would say, they would have to conscript Allied soldiery and get money from the pockets of Allied taxpayers. (Cheers.) It could not be done this time at the cost of Indian lives and Indian money. Already they had heard the Indian troops refused to fight in Persia (cheers) but in the House of Commons the Government replying to a question said they had no official confirmation and it was probably false. "Well," said the speaker, "I am here to tell you that if Muslim religious requirements are not respected, if Indian sentiment is flouted, if the pledges deliberately given are repeatedly disregarded, and Muslim majorities are placed under Christian minorities, Greek or Armenian, even if it is probably false to day it will be probably true to-morrow". (Loud cheers.) It was not to make an appeal to Labour that he had come but to convey his warning although he came as a friend to Labour and wanted to give this warning in the friendliest possible manner. (Cheers)

Once more he thanked to Chairman, the Executive and the Standing Orders Committee for giving him a hearing and thanked the Conference for its sympathetic and warm reception.

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY!

For two days Mohamed Ali spoke before a Jury at the famous trial of Karachi in 1921.

He was arrested because of a resolution passed at a Khilafat Conference held at Karachi over which he had presided. His brother and he were charged with five other co-workers, one of whom was a Hindu and a religious dignitary of great eminence, with conspiring to seduce Muslim troops from their allegiance.

Every one expected the sentence of transportation for life. But the Jury, which consisted of one European, three Christians and two Hindus, gave a unanimous verdict of 'Not Guilty'.

In this historic trial, the question arose, for the first time in the history of British India, whether a British subject could be punished for obeying God's law when the King's law came into conflict with it. Mohamed Ali declared, "We do not recognise the King any longer as our King—we do not owe any loyalty to any man who denies our right to be loyal to God."

V

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY!

MOHAMED ALI before addressing the Jury turning to the Court said:

"Can I have the Jury on this side? I have not seen their *faces yet.* I want to seduce them like the troops." (Laughter in court.)

The Court directed the Jurors to change their seats accordingly, and the Judge also changed the position of his seat turning to the left directly facing the accused.

Maulana Mohamed Ali then rose amid pindrop silence and addressing the Jury said:

GENTLEMEN of the Jury! I just asked the Presiding Judge that he might permit me to see your faces, because with the exception of one of your number I had not hitherto been able to see your faces. And I also said that I want to seduce the Jury. Of course, there was behind that another intention, not the ultimate object perhaps, but incidental to it, as the Public Prosecutor would say, I wanted you to act as a screen in front of the ladies now behind you, or the Public Prosecutor may add yet another charge of seduction against me (laughter), but after all I find that as a result of my effort at seduction I have turned the Judge also towards me to-day. (Laughter.)

Gentlemen, I think I am going to take as much time as I can. So it is necessary to tell you beforehand that if I intended to defend myself or my friends and to escape from transportation for life or the gallows or the jail, I don't know what the Judge has in store for me—it would have been absolutely unpardonable. No, gentlemen, for that purpose I would not have wasted a single moment of your time or of mine.

I do not want any defence. I have no defence to offer. And there is no need of defence, for it is not we who are on trial.

It is the Government itself that is on trial. It is the Judge himself who is on trial. It is the whole system of public prosecutions, the entire provisions of the law that are on trial. It is not a question of my defence. It is a very clear issue, and I thanked the Government in the lower Court, because for the first time it came out into the open and gave us a chance of having a decision on a very clear-cut and pointed issue. That very clear-cut and pointed issue is this. Is God's law for a British subject to be more important or the King's law—a man's law? Call him His Majesty or His Imperial Majesty—exalt him as much as you like—show all obedience to him, show him all the loyalty you can,—pay him all the respect, entertain even superstitions about him if you like but the question is—is this respect or are these superstitions going to stand even for the slightest moment in the way of loyalty which every human being owes to God? Gentlemen, I think not for my own sake, nor for the sake of my co-accused, but I think for you. It is a misfortune that there is not a single Muslim among you. Three of you are Christians, and two are Hindus. But that does not matter at all. I am speaking to human beings. I am speaking mostly to Indians. I do not know whether all of you are Indians, perhaps one of you is not though he too may have his domicile in India and may have come to regard India, although an Englishman, as his home, and may therefore be regarded as an Indian. I am therefore speaking to a majority of you at least who come from a country which is imbued with the spirit of religion and which is traditionally a spiritual country and which has striven through the ages for the exaltation of the spirit as against the flesh.

Gentlemen, we hear so much of toleration in these enlightened days, and I do not think even the Public Prosecutor would contradict me if I say that we all want toleration. The British Government has never tired of saying that it is a tolerant Government, and that British rule is firmly based on toleration. I do not think that the Government of any civilised country in this twentieth century could ever say that it is against toleration. But what is toleration after all? It is this, as a well-known man said—"Sir, I disagree most heartily with every word of what you have said but, damn it, I shall fight to the last drop of my blood

for your right to say it." That is toleration! That is to say, toleration is required for disagreement, it is required where people are not of the same opinion, where people hold very different views, where they have wide differences. Otherwise there is no necessity for toleration. But the tolerant man tolerates all this and sacrifices everything for the maintenance of tolerance. Now, I might say, a man might hold very foolish opinions. I am sorry many men do. I think the Public Prosecutor for one holds some very foolish opinions—and we have yet got to see what kind of opinion the Judge holds; that would be after I am silenced—but it is not the question whether a man's judgment is right or wrong—people's judgment may be foolish—the question is this, when any person or a body of persons give you a pledge of freedom to hold your own opinions and act up to them, then I think it is their duty to abide by that pledge.

Now, gentlemen, what the case is against us we want the whole world to understand. After all, the result of the decision here will not be confined to the audience in the hall, or to the few scores of thousands of people in Karachi. It was said that the Resolution that was passed here was not meant for that small body of audience comprising a few *Ulama* and a few thousand people but it was meant for a larger audience. Now, this trial too is meant for more than the audience here in this hall, certainly far more than the five of you. It is really meant for the whole world. We want to have our right to get the protection of the law for our religious beliefs and practices recognised. Let the Government repent and say that we have seen the error of our ways. Turning to Mr. Ross Alston): These are the words which my friend Mr. Ross Alston wanted me to say as my last words, and they shall be my last words—but with regard to the action proper for the Government: (Laughter) But will the Government say that? Is it going to abide by that pledge of Freedom of Faith? Or, would the Government says,—No, we are powerful, we are strong, we have dreadnoughts, we have aeroplanes, we have all this soldiery, we have machine-guns, we have beaten the most powerful nations in Europe, though, of course, with the help of twenty-six allies (laughter) and India's men,

money, and other resources—but that is another story (laughter) —we cannot tolerate your religious opinions and acts. If they say that, we can understand that. Therefore it is not for the purpose of defending ourselves but it is to make this issue clear because it is a national issue, nay, more than that, it is an issue on which the history of the world to a great extent depends—whether in this civilised century man's word shall be deemed more binding than the word of God. The trial is not "Mohamed Ali and six others *versus* the Crown," but "God *versus* man." This case is therefore between Gods and man. That is the trial. The whole question is "Shall God dominate over man or shall man dominate over God?"

Now, gentlemen, you were here though it was not intended for you—you happened to be here—when we refused to stand up when the Judge asked us to do so. We have always dissociated ourselves from and repudiated the idea of showing any disrespect to the Judge. We are not foolish enough to create any unnecessary unpleasantness or to worry the Judge or irritate him. We have no grudge against him. But the whole question was with regard to respect to a man as against respect to God. As my brother has said in the lower Court, and as I say before you now, we do not recognise the King any longer as our King—we do not owe any loyalty to any man who denies our right to be loyal to God. I have not a word to say against the King—I have not a word against the Royal family. But where the question of God comes in as against the Government, I cannot have any respect for a Government when the Government demands from me that I must not first respect God and his laws. Therefore the whole question really is, as I have said, between God and man. The Public Prosecutor has very skilfully stated his case and when he came to our religious beliefs and the commandments of God he was anxious to get over it as quickly as possible. He was skating over thin ice! He brushed all that aside. Now I challenge him, I challenge the Judge to give a decision on the point. It is not at all a question of fact with which you, gentlemen of the Jury, have to deal. If the Judge deals with the question of law in his summing up and sentences us, if the verdict of the Jury goes against

us in the case in which you act as Jurors, and if he exercises his right as Judge to decide both as regards the facts and the law in the cases in which you gave your opinion as Assessors, if he sentences us disregarding our religious obligation, then our course will be clear. It does not matter what punishment we are likely to get and under what section of the Penal Code we get is, as there are any number of Sections 120-B., 131, 109, 505, 117 and so on.

As regards those sections and the various charges, so far as I am concerned, I was greatly confused, and I am trying to compute how many years altogether I shall get. (Laughter.) I have but one life and I do not know if it can cover the many years that I shall get if I am punished according to my deserts. (Laughter.) But that is absolutely immaterial.

The whole thing is this. I want a decision from the Court on behalf of this Government that the Courts of India cannot give any protection to a man who does the thing that I have done—though it admits that it is precisely the thing that his religion demands, his God demands from him. God is not clamouring from the housetop. He is shouting from His eternally high throne—clamouring from there: "Man whom I have created from just a clot of blood, whom I raised to whatever power and glory you possess, whatever you have and whatever you are, it is I who gave it to you and made all this for you—*I want you to serve Me and not a creature of Mine.*" Whatever respect I may have for the King, I may not bow before him when he asks me not to bow before my God and His Commandments.

The Judge had hinted something about the beliefs of some sects. He said suppose a sect of the Hindus demands human sacrifice. It is not a question of individual belief that was involved in our case. Then the Public Prosecutor had said we had different sects among ourselves. We quarrelled among ourselves as to which of these is right and which is wrong. Well, is it not a question of which is wrong. Well, it is not a question of our belief alone; it is the question of the belief of every Muslim. But even if it was a case of a particular sect, do you mean to say that

the Proclamation of the Queen in 1858 required at that time that each and every one of the 300 millions of the people of India must be agreed, all the heavens and the whole earth and all the planets and the men in the moon and all the men in Mars, every one must be agreed that this was the one true and correct Faith and it was then that the Queen's Proclamation provided protection? No protection would have been required for such a Faith. What is the Penal Code itself for? It is to give you the protection that I seek that I may not hurt your religious feelings. In to-day's *New Time* we find that some men—Khilafat men, have been prosecuted in Calcutta because they hurt the religious feelings of a *policeman*—gentlemen, (laughter) of a policeman, by asking him to resign Government service. (Laughter.) I have not the least doubt that these men will be condemned but you see there is a provision of law even for protecting a policeman's religious feelings. Take another case. A little piece of stone which some men worship with full intensity—with as much intensity as my own when I say my prayers, possibly with greater intensity than mine—you do not approve of it—you heartily disapproved of it and want to remove it. But can you do it? You cannot. The law gives the man who worships it its protection. Why does it do so? It is not because the man's religion is good but because of the man's feelings. Because the framers of the law say that it is not good religion that they seek to protect but the man's religious feelings. It is not the objective religion but the subjective feelings of the man too that have to be protected. It is this that Lord Macaulay and others sought to protect the religious feelings of a brother—man, however foolish and superstitious and wrong he may be. It is that you have got to protect and the law provides this protection. But I base my case upon the Queen's Proclamation and the King's Proclamation. So the Judge has got to declare whether these Proclamations have any value in a Law Court or not. That picture (pointing to the picture of King Edward VII) is there to remind the Judge that he has to give us the protection of the King's law. You will take that law from him because you cannot either take the law from me or from my friend there (pointing to the Public Prosecutor). If you took your law from him you will be in a perilous state, truly a sad

plight. (Laughter.) But in this case, it is not the case of any man's individual opinion or the opinion of a small number of Muslims though you cannot hurt their feelings, the religious feelings even of these. Here it is not a question of a sect but of a religion. No person who calls himself a Muslim, can go outside this book (pointing to the Qur'an). Look at this translation in English. This book is full of repetitions. But you see what a small book it is in spite of its repetitions, altogether it is only about 500 pages. It is this book which constitutes the chief source of our religious laws. I wish to explain this so that there my not be any misunderstanding. You ought to know where my religion is to be found. I do not take it from any individuall's beliefs. My religion is all contained in the first instance in this tiny volume. Then come the traditions of ou r Prophet. But about this original source (pointing to the Qur'an) there is not a single sect of Muslims that differs about a single syllable. Therefore you will find that here is a solid bed-rock of our Faith about which there is no difference of opinion. In the case of the Prophet's traditions, even if one of the companions of the Prophet said that the Prophet said so and so and if that tradition, handed down from his companions, is against or in contravention of anything contained in this book, no Muslim will accept that tradition. We shall not believe anything that is attributed to the Prophet, if it is against the Qur'an. But if it explains it (the Qur'an) or supplement it *adjuvandi causaer supplendi cause*, we may accept it.

There is nothing which is required by a man's religion which can be an offence in British India as long as the Proclamation holds. You cannot in this country ask a Hindu to kill a cow. Before enlisting recruits you have to take people's answers down and you bind them by a certain oath. This is the form (showing the form) upon which the soldiers are enlisted. People take the oath that they will abide by their pledge. Yet not a single Hindu solider who takes that oath will kill a cow in spite of all the allegiance that he might owe to the King. Therefore if this officer commands him to kill a cow and the Hindu soldier refuses it, will he be hauled up before this Court? If the commander

orders a Hindu or a Muslim soldier to use cow or swine-greased cartridges—which the Hindus and the Muslims won't touch and refuse to do it, could he be brought before any Court of Law? The Queen's Proclamation will give him the protection, no matter what your Penal Code might say. So long as what I do is enjoined by my religion, no Indian Penal Code or other Penal Law can touch me because the Queen's Proclamation is there. As long as the Queen's successor is the ruler, as long as the King's picture is here, you, the Judge, will have to take your orders from the Queen's Proclamation and the King's, otherwise I will know that the whole thing was a camouflage, and that all his talk about tolerance was sheer cant and hypocrisy. Now, in this form you will see there is a question (reads the form) "*Are you willing to go wherever ordered by land or sea and allow caste usage not to interfere with your military duty?*" I take it that every soldier at the time of enlistment has got to answer this in the affirmative and to sign this form. That does not allow the Commandant to believe that the religious commandment is therefore binding on a soldier. Supposing the man is asked to kill a cow by his officer to provide beef for him. The man absolutely refuses that and he quotes Scriptures and Shastras. No section of your Penal Code will ever assist the Judge or the Jury to declare that this man would be punished because he is acting according to his religion. Say that he can be punished and I sit down. No, gentlemen, you have to write on every section throughout the Penal Code and every other law, the favourite phrase of the lawyers "without prejudice", *i.e.*, "without prejudice to a man's religion." You say that there are bad customs like "Satee" which he cannot allow. Then you should declare the customs which you will allow and the conditions on which you will be tolerant. Even murder is not murder if the man's religion demands it. And the Queen gave the law's protection by the Proclamation to that religion. You say there are many religions and sects in this country. Well, then you should have proclaimed that such and such religions shall receive protection. You should have made it clear that on these conditions alone whatsoever wants to live within this Empire will be allowed to live and be regarded as a loyal subject. Whoever did not want to live within the orbit

of this loyalty, that man would either have walked out of this Empire or would have kicked you out of it. My friend (the P.P.) told you that we are very sincere, that we are people who are straightforward. I am thankful to him for this compliment. But he did this for his own purpose and I am going to use it for my purpose how. Gentlemen, you will now understand that we are not the people who are going to be easily frightened into telling untruths to escape punishment if we deserve it on the evidence laid before you. Whatever evidence there is in this case is of a trivial character and I will not worry you about these trivial things. Islam is not going to bother about the evidence regarding the time we left the Kenyashala or returned to it or about the Subjects Committee which was led to prove our association. Association with whom? Association with my brother! In that case the Public Prosecutor could similarly have given the whole of past history and with his chronological order should have placed the evidence before you that my brother was present at my birth; that we lived together in the same home: that he took away my pocket money when we were in school and when I demanded back my money he beat me black and blue. (Laughter.) This is association! (Laughter.) All this, gentlemen of the Jury, is trivial evidence. The main case is, does the Queen's Proclamation give protection to the Muslim religion or not? My whole contention is that if we ask the Muslim soldier to give up serving in the British Army and to refuse to recruit and ask other people not to be recruited and we say and prove that it is to be found in the Qur'an, then we are immune. You cannot punish us. Where the Penal Code is not opposed to the Qur'an, it stands. When the Penal Code is in antagonism to the Qur'an, it does not stand. It must go. That is the whole case. If I am wrong in this, let the Judge decide. I will be content. You, gentlemen, must not take what the Prosecution says about individual opinion as affecting our case, though even in that case we have got to think of the man's religious feelings. I have given you seventeen or eighteen out of the thirty-four *Hadithes* and the six verses from the Qur'an cited by Maulana Husain Ahmad Sahib. From these very citations the gentlemen of the Jury and the Presiding Judge may understand very clearly what a Muslim must not do. The

Public Prosecutor has talked of verses cited without their contexts. It was to avoid this that I have given long extracts from the Qur'an so that you may be easily able to understand the context. I say, ask any Muslim of any sect, send for any man, even the Court chaprasi, and ask him to say if what I say is written in the Qur'an or not. He will easily point it out for you if he can read the Qur'an, and if he knows Arabic he will explain it to you. There would be no difference of opinion. I challenge the Government,—I challenge the Prosecution to produce any man, to produce any juridical opinion or *Fatwa* to show that what we declared is wrong

Now, gentlemen, I went to say something about the charges. It is not for you, gentlemen, nor for me, to object to the misjoinder of charges. If I am to address any one on that point, I shall address the Judge. I think I am within my rights if I refer to this. But so far as you are concerned, I may tell you, gentlemen, that any number of sections 109, 117, 120-B, 131 and 505 of the Indian Penal Code have been jumbled together for the purpose of creating confusion—though section 233 of the Criminal Procedure Code lays down that these several charges cannot be joined. Section 233 runs thus :—

(*Reads Sections 233 and 234*)

The Court: I do not think you should trouble yourself in reading this to the Jury. There cannot be any recasting of the charges at this late stage.

Mohamed Ali: The general rule is that the individuals should be separately tried and the charges should be separately dealt with, because if this is not done it will prejudice the accused and it will prejudice the gentlemen of the Jury. I do not know why they are jumbled together, but it seems to me that all representing the Crown have criminally conspired (laughter) so that so many sections of the law have been brought in only to confuse everybody. I do not know whether any of you, gentlemen, have understood them clearly. I did not quite understand what was the first charge, and what was the second charge, what was to go before the Judge and before you as Assessors. It was not quite clear until to-day. When I was being brought here from Waltair,

one of the policemen escorting me in the special train asked me with what offence I had been charged. I did not know but told him that my warrant had recited Sections 120, 131, 205 and 117. The policeman drolly remarked: "They may apply as many as they like, for after all they are home-made sections." (Laughter.) I wonder if any of you, gentlemen, have played billiards. Well there are three balls in billiard and you score by hitting your ball in such a way that it hits the other two or hits another and then drops into one of the pockets attached to the table or forces the other balls into these pockets. But sometimes these cursed balls lie on the table in such a manner that you don't know what to do with them to score and this happens infernally or frequently to the beginner. Well the advice that you will in such a case get from the more experienced is to hit hard and trust the rest to luck (laughter) and not unoften, one scores. What is called a fluke in your opponent's case and a very difficult stroke, of course, in your own way? (Laughter.) Well, gentlemen, that is precisely what the Prosecution has done with these charges. It has hit hard and trusts you and the Judge for a score. Out of so many sections one or two may manage to stick. (Laughter.) The whole thing, so far as I understand, is that there are two main offences with which we are charged. The first offence is an agreement constituting criminal conspiracy and the second is the attempt to commit an offence (after interruption by the Court), agreement to commit criminal offence which makes it a criminal conspiracy and secondly to commit an act in pursuance of that conspiracy. These are the first two charges. Then comes the question of my statement, which was likely to seduce the troops from their loyalty. Then, of course, comes the abetment by the several co-accused. I am told the only thing that will go before you as Jury will be the attempt in pursuance of that conspiracy. But I will take up the first charge first—as regards an agreement. I am not quite sure whether any of you, gentlemen, know that these Sections 120-A and 120-B were added to the Penal Code not so very long ago and I happened to be present in the Council meeting in which the Conspiracy Bill was passed. I was sitting in the press gallery, during the lunch interval, when my old friend Sir William Vincent came into the hall of the Council. I

was sitting with a distinguished journalist who has since become a Moderate leader and a particular friend of Government. Sir William Vincent asked me jovially if we two were conspiring. I said to him, "For conspiring an agreement is necessary, and as you know only too well, I never agree with anybody." (Laughter.) And, gentlemen of the Jury, truly enough there has been no agreement. No evidence has been led about agreement, whether here or in the lower Court. "It is a matter of presumption," says the Public Prosecutor. And it is really upon "presumption" that they are going to transport me for life—to take me away from my family, to take me away from my girls, to take me away from my wife and aged mother, to take me away from my country, which is still more important to me. And all this on a matter of "presumption"! Not a single witness comes in to say that there was even a discussion about it. I am not quite sure whether the Judge was filling the gaps in the evidence by asking us questions about this. Anyhow I satd in reply that we never discussed the question about the troops. We are told by the Prosecution that the accused knew more than the Prosecution. I think that is perfectly true. As a matter of fact the Prosecution knows so very little (laughter) and they pretend to increase their knowledge with the assistance of the inventions of the police. (Laughter.) Yes, the accused knew what the Prosecution does not. But have they not put all their cards on the table before the committing Magistrate?

You, gentlemen, have had a long recitation in this court when the Clerk of the Crown read my statement made in the lower Court. In that statement I showed very clearly the whole genesis of these prosecutions, and I hope you listened to it very carefully. Well, I am supposed to be a very frank man—we are very frank people, *ex-hypothesi*, you will take it that we are truthful people, also. So far as any agreement to tell the Muslim troops in India—even what the law of Islam is concerned, there war none beyond this resolution before you. But the day a man calls himself a Muslim he is bound to abide by what is contained in the Qur'an. If one single syllable of it I reject I am not a Muslim. I may be the worst sinner. I may be no matter

however so, sinful I will still be—so long as I do not reject anything out of this book—I will still be a Muslim. But the moment I reject this, however pious or otherwise I may be, I am not a Muslim. And whatever is contained in the Qur'an I am required by the same law of the Qur'an to go and preach to everybody in the world—even to non-Muslims. Take the case of my revered friend here, Maulana Husain Ahmad Sahib. He has been teaching in Medina—he is the disciple of Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hassan Sahtb, the late Shaikh-ul-Hind. It was from the Hejaz that he was arrested and taken to Egypt and then to Malta. He was teaching at Medina for ten years. He taught there the Prophet's traditions. Supposing he sits outside his house and he reads the Qur'an and he reads those very verses that "Whoever kills a Muslim wilfully will find his reward in Hell. He will abide therein for ever. God will be wrathful with him. God will curse him. And God had prepared for him a severe torment." Supposing when he was reciting this a Muslim soldier was passing there. Will you say that Maulana Husain Ahmad has committed a crime under Section 505, Indian Penal Code? If you will say this, then why all this tall talk about toleration? Or suppose a Muslim sepoy came to a mosque; would the Maulana be a criminal because he recited this verse in the service while that soldier was there? Take another case, a sepoy comes to him and says, "Maulana, I want to know what is the law of Islam: I am required to go to Mesopotamia to fight against the Khalifa? Is it lawful for me to go there and fight against Muslims?" The Maulana says it is unlawful and if he says it is lawful, then he becomes a Kafar. If he keeps silent, God will curse him and the whole world will curse him. Therefore he will have to say, "No, it is not lawful." It is his duty as religious teacher when a man comes in and asks him what is the Islamic law, to explain to him truly the law of Islam; but if he cannot, for fear of the Penal Code, tell the truth, then the curse of God comes in.

Take another case. The Maulana goes in a train and finds Muslims going to Mesopotamia to fight against other Muslims and the Khalifa or against people who are waging Jehad. The Maulana tells them, it is unlawful, this is not allowed by Islam.

The Prophet says, "Do not become Kafar by killing each other." Will you give the Maulana no protection of the law? You may say—well, it is all right for him to say this when somebody comes, and asks him what is the Islamic law, it is all right for him to say so as a religious teacher. But it is not his duty to go to the housetop and proclaim it *from there*: Then it would be seduction. Then it would come under Section 505 and Section 117, or for the matter of that 121-A or 121-B. I say that *even that is intolerance*. Because the Qur'an lays down clearly who will receive salvation and who will not (Quotes the Qur'an). I am quoting that small chapter of the Qur'an in which God swears by the world's history. In that God says—"I swear by the world's history—I swear by all the time that has passed before that all are certainly in perdition but the Faithful who will do good works and tell other people to do the right thing and to have fortitude in case they are not successful." The four conditions required for a Muslim to win salvation are contained in this, the shortest chapter of the Qur'an. A man's salvation depends upon these: that he must act upon that Faith. A man who believes in Islam, says his prayers, gives alms, fasts in the Ramazan, goes to Mecca and does not hurt anybody. Do you think that he will have salvation with only this? No! Because the Qur'an says—the third step too you *must* take—that you must go and preach those good things to everybody. You must go and propagate these doctrines. You are not born to save only yourself. You are here to save your neighbours as well. Therefore the three things that a Muslim must do are that he must believe, he must act according to his belief, and he must also propogate that belief. If a Muslim says that he believes that killing another Muslim is *haram* and yet goes and kills him, he may not win salvation. But he is nevertheless a Muslim if he really believes that he is Kafar. But suppose he believes that it *is haram* and does not kill another Muslim, he may not yet win salvation if he sits idly and lets others kill him. But if he is not idle and goes and tells other people also that it is *haram*, then too he may not win salvation, unless he persists in his propaganda even if his efforts fail. If he fails in his propaganda and he suffers because of Section 505 and Section 117 and is sent to jail—what is he to do? He must

show fortitude! He may be hanged, he may be drowned, he may be quartered. But he must show fortitude and perseverance in his mission. Then only will he win salvation and escape perdition. He must not try to change God's law by one single syllable. He must abide by it and face all the consequence.

Gentlemen, it is not such an easy thing to go to Paradise and claim the embraces of the Houries. By the clipping one's moustache and growing a long beard and muttering prayers one does not become a Muslim. He has got to do all those things but he has got to do many other things besides, because we are required to do all these things by our religion. It is not enough that I should not go to war. I have got to go and induce other Muslims also not to go to war to fight their brothers. I shall induce them in every possible way. I must take the rifle out of his hand—but not by force, not by compulsion but by clearly expounding our religious law. We are saved only when we have saved these people from going to fight and kill other Muslims.

Gentlemen, a military gentleman like Col. Gwyer in this case, went to Bombay. His name is Col. Beach. On the 20th October, so a telegram in the "Pioneer" tells us, this gallant officer who had gone down from Army Headquarters Simla, met the members of my profession perhaps to seduce them from their duty (laughter)—editors of local newspapers and news agencies in a round table conference and among other things what this military officer said was the following with reference to the arrest of Ali Brothers, though the matter is still *sub judice*. (Reads from a paper.) "Referring to the arrest of the Ali Brothers, Col. Beach speaking as a soldier said that it would be worth while asking those who are trying to seduce soldiers to consider for a moment if a soldier who once turns a deserter would be loyal to any other cause to which he was won over." That was Col. Beach speaking, as he tells you, as a soldier. Well done, Col. Beach. (Laughter.) Almost sound doctrine and a remarkable good logic for soldier. (Laughter.) But speaking not as a soldier but as a Muslim may I ask who is the seducer? Every child born into this world is first a soldier of God and

it is men like Col. Beach and Col. Gwyer who are the seducers that seduce him from his first duty and his sole allegiance. May we not equally ask these Beaches and Gwyers if God's soldiers who once turned deserters would be loyal to them and to their cause to which they had been won over? A man's first duty is to his God. The Qur'an tells us that before men's souls were put into their bodies they were asked by God. "Am I not your Lord?" and they answered in unison "Aye." Well, hang all the souls, gentlemen. There was all the agreement that you need for a criminal conspiracy under Sections 120-A and 120-B. (Laughter.) No, gentlemen, it is your Beaches of the Army Headquarters of Simla and your Gwyers of the Western Command that seduce soldiers from their duty. If you have and faith, if you have any belief in God then your first duty, your prior allegiance is to God. Is it not the duty of Christians who believe in Christ? Is it not the belief of the Hindus? Is it not a Hindu's first duty to obey Lord Krishna? Still we talk of allegiance to Kings, still we talk of loyalty. An Englishman—not a Muslim but a Christian, Mr. H.G. Wells wrote a book after the war—a sort of allegory of the whole British nation—I do not know whether any of you has read it. It is called "Mr. Brittling Sees it Through" and what does he say? What does Mr. Brittling, who is supposed to be the average Englishman, see through that terrible war? He says that religion is the first thing and it is the last thing. A man who does not begin with it has not lived a true life, has not found the true meaning of the life. His only allegiance—his only duty is to God. He might have the scraps of honour, he may have his fragments of loyalty; but when it comes to the test of loyalty to God, allegiance to God—all these fragmentary loyalties, all these scraps of honour, they are like a mere scrap of paper passed through fire that shrivels up and is scattered to the four winds or merely blackens a man's hand as so much dirt. That is what an average Englishman has seen through this war and publicly said. And it is after this war that God's law is be brushed aside for us in India because man's law—120-B and 131 and 505 and 117—is to prevail over God's law. When I have Swaraj I will see to it that I do not let any one

seduce my fellow countrymen from their true loyalty. But so long as I want to reside in British India, I claim the protection of the Queen's proclamation. If I were a Hindu I would have said the same thing. What was Christ supposed to have said —(interrupted). (The Court rose for the day in the midst of the sentence.)

Mohamed Ali: Well, gentleman, the Court stops me at "Christ". I shall tell you to-morrow what Christ is supposed to have said.

(*The next day the Court sat at 11 a.m. as usual. Maulana Mohamed Ali continuing his address to the Jury said :*

Gentlemen of the Jury, I was explaining to you that the Proclamation of the Queen made in 1858 confirmed by the late King Edward in the Proclamation made on the 50th anniversary of the Queen's Proclamation and also confirmed by a letter addressed to the Princes and People of India by King George after his accession to the throne—gave the protection of the law to His Majesty's subjects in British India with regard to their religious beliefs and religious practices, and I was telling you that was the whole of our case. And that whatever may be an offence according to the Penal Code or for the matter of that any other Code, if any person—be he Hindu or Muslim or Christian—does a thing which his religion requires him to do, then even if that is an offence under the Penal Code or any other law that is enforced in British India, that law cannot stand in his way and he cannot be punished. The law gives him its protection as stated in these three Proclamations. But it is not his words that you are to take; he has got to prove it that his religion requires it. He has got to explain it. As I have told you yesterday, this trial is really a very important trial because after all the clear issue involved in it is whether God's law is to prevail or whether man's law is to override God's law, whether the Queen's Proclamation has any value, whether the King's Solemn Pledge has any value or not, whether the Judge is bound by it, whether the Jury is bound by it or not. It will not be possible for me to explain my case when the Judge has summed up. I do not know how he is going to sum up. But it is on this point that the Judge's summing

up will be of importance. You cannot take the law either from the Public Prosecutor or from me. But at the same time I ask you to understand, gentlemen of the Jury, that if you to-day deny a Hindu or a Muslim or a Christian his right to do his duty to God, to do what his Faith enjoins him to do under pains and penalties—though not of this world but of another, a future world—if you not allow him to do what his religion demands of him to do, then I say, you yourselves will be a party to the destruction of religious freedom enjoyed in this country and given by the Queen's Proclamation. It is not a question of a particular faith, it is not a question of the Hindu Faith or the ChristianFaith or the Muslim Faith or the Jewish Faith. Every Faith, even that of a sceptic, even that of an atheist has to be protected but the freedom of all these people will be taken away and I ask you, will you be a part to this? I was telling you yesterday what Mr. H.G. Wells has said in his book "God, the Invisible King" and also in another book of his, a novel "The Soul of a Bishop."

He writes: "A saying has been attributed to the Master Jesus Christ" (on whom be peace), "Render unto Cæsar what is Cæsar's, and render unto God what is God's." And then he asks who is the Cæsar that wants to share this world with God? What is Cæsar's that is not at the same time God's? The world is not divided into two parts—one God's and the other Cæsar's. No, there are not the two kings of Brentford. God is the sole Ruler. And if the king or any other human creature, be he the head of a Republic or the Judge or a member of the Jury, demands from you anything he must demand for God and through God. If they demand from you anything which is against God, then that demand is not to be satisfied. It is God alone whose demand is to be satisfied. This, says Mr. H. G. Wells, is coming to be the universal modern Religion. Whether it is that or not, it is certainly the religion of every Muslim. It is not a question of my individual faith, my own whims and idiosyncracies. I challenge the Government—I challenge the Public Prosecutor to produce any man in this trial—to produce any Muslim who could say that, in spite of what God says.

Therefore you have got to see to this that every Muslim who

lives in British India—anywhere that a Muslim dwels—he is under the protection of the Queen's Proclamation. He is to follow the law of the land but without prejudice to his faith. When we were interned we said the same thing to the Viceroy as we are telling you now. When they wanted to release us from internment, but on certain conditions, that we shall do this and not do the other, we said we shall agree to those conditions, but without prejudice to our faith. Again as long ago as the 9th July, 1929, we sent a letter through the Superintendent of Betul Jail, where we were confined, to the Viceroy. Therein we said:

> "But since Government is apparently uninformed about the manner in which our Faith colours and is meant to colour all our actions, including those which, for the sake of convenience, are generally characterised as mundane, one thing must be made clear, and it is this: Islam does not permit the believer to pronounce an adverse judgment against another believer without convincing proof; and we could not, of course, fight against our Muslim brothers without making sure that they were guilty of wanton aggression, and did not take up arms in defence of their faith."

This is precisely what in September 1917 we had told the Hon'ble the Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad who had visited us at Chindwara and had referred to the possibility of foreign aggression: and he had thereupon wired to Simla to the Hon'ble Mr. Jinnah apparently for communication to the Government that he was entirely satisfied about our political attitude. We do not want a change of masters but we do want the speedy establishment of a government responsible to the united people of India, and we hoped we have made matters clear beyond the possibility of any doubt or misunderstanding.

One thing more has to be made more clear as we have since discovered that the doctrine to which we shall now revert is not so generally known in non-Muslim and particularly in official circles as it ought to be. A Muslim's faith does not consist merely in believing in a set of doctrines and living up to that belief himself; he must also exert himself to the fullest extent of

his power, of course without resort to any compulsion, to the end that others also conform to the prescribed beliefs and practices. This is spoken of in the Holy Qur'an as *Amr-bin-maroof* and *Nahi-anil-munker* and certain distinct chapters of the holy Prophet's traditions relate to this essential doctrine of Islam. A Muslim cannot say; "I am not my brother's keeper," for in a sense he is and his own salvation cannot be assured to him unless he exhorts others also to do good and exhorts them against doing evil. If, therefore, any Muslim is being compelled to wage war against the *Mujahid* of Islam, he must not only be a "conscientious objector" himself, but must, if he values his own salvation, persuade his brothers also at whatever risk to himself to take similar objection. Then, and not until then, can he hope for salvation. This is our belief as well as the belief of every other Muslim and in our humble way we seek to live up to it, and if we are denied freedom to inculcate this doctrine we must conclude that the land where this freedom does not exist is not safe of Islam.

Now, this was the first charge we had brought against the Government. "During the war Muslims have been required, in defiance of their religious obligations," mark the words, gentlemen, "to assist Government in waging war against the Khalifa and those engaged in *Jehed*," And what do you think the Viceroy did? He did not hang us under Section 121 for waging war against the King. He did not transport us for life under Section 131. He simply got us out of internment and arranged that I should go to England and explain the same Islamic law there to the Prime Minister and to other memeber of the Cabinet. But for the same we are now tried for criminal conspiracy; what is the special offence in our case? What becomes of the case against the thousands and hundreds of thousand millions of people who are saying the same thing to-day? Why are they not with us? I have complained about the misjoinder of charges because too many accused are tried for too many offences. But you have not room enough in this hall—nay in any hall—to try each and every one of those together who say that it is his belief too, that it is his *Dharma* also. As I have said so often it is not

a question of individual belief. I, who lived with Englishmen, who went to England to be educated at Oxford—I who was most friendly with the English people, even I have got to say it because it is a religious duty, even I have got to say that no Muslims should serve in the British Army where he is forced to kill his own brethren for the advancement of unrighteousness. I said it then, and I say it now, that it is religiously unlawful. I said it then, I say it now, and I shall say it all the time. It does not matter, if I am hanged for it and I hope when I am dead and gone my carcase will shout out from the grave that it is the Faith of the Muslims.

However, I now come to the first charge against us on which you have to sit here merely as Assessors. You have been told and have seen for yourselves that not a single witness was put into the box to prove that there was at any time any agreement. My friend here asked you to take that on presumption. What a presumption ! Are you going to have us merely for this presumption for which there is not the slightest piece of evidence, absolutely none ?

No man—not a single witness, has said that he ever saw us, heard us or suspected us to be conspiring, agreeing to commit any offence. I was in England in the month of February 1920, and probably on the very day I was interviewing the officiating Secretary of State when a Conference was held in Calcutta, in which certain resolutions were passed. That was evidence against me. Presumption has to do duty for proof and any evidence is sufficient to transport us for life. Gentlemen, I may tell you that I knew nothing about the conspiracy. When my brother went to Assam I did not know. I did not know of it until the P.P. got up and said that he would bring in a witness to prove this. It was for the first time I learnt that my brother had gone there. The rascal ! He goes there without my knowledge and I am to be transported for life. That's the worst of being a younger brother. (Laughter.) But even that is no proof of agreement to commit a criminal offence. You cannot presume that. It must be proved and proved without a shadow of doubt. As for the Karachi Conference, my brother could

have got off on the score of not having spoken. But the Public Prosecutor can fill that gap too. In Australia there was a farmer who had a son—and I am afraid—not a very clever son. People, heartlessly, even called him fool, and wherever his father took him, through his folly the father got into a sort of disgrace. Once the father was invited to a feast and the son wanted to go too. But the father refused. He was afraid that his son would speak and would be found to be a fool and he would be once more disgraced. The son then promised that he would not utter a single syllable. And so his father at last consented to take the fool to the feast. The son went there and sat in a snug corner. Several persons put him several questions but the son did not utter a single syllable in reply. So when a man was putting him another question one of the guests said—"What is the use of asking this man any question, can't you see that he is a fool? The son immediately shouted out at the top of his voice, addressing his father, who was at the other end of the table, "Father, father, they have found it out; but I did not speak." (Laughter.) So the P.P. too has found it out that my brother was a conspirator at the Karachi Conference though he did not speak. (Laughter.) The P.P. has said that we are earnest people. By the same token, gentlemen, we are truthful people. And although I am not a witness deposing on oath I say it that there was never at any time any discussion among ourselves about the declarations of Islamic law regarding the Muslim troops serving in the British Army. The Judge put me this question and I said that there was no discussion at any time. Why should there be a discussion about it at all? Supposing to-morrow we hold a conference of the Muslims assembled together in Karachi and declare that there is no god but one God and Muhammad is His Prophet. Do you think it will be necessary for us to sit together and come to agreement? The moment that I say that I am a Muslim there is that agreement. But there cannot be any time limit to it. It cannot be only between February 1920 and September 1921 (of course you know the addition to the period of the charge was the particular gift of my little friend there (pointing to Mr. Ross Alston). There was no mention of 1920

before the Committing Magistrate. This 'slight is alteration' that my slight friend has made to the charge which means twelve months more added to the period of the charge of conspiracy against us. So, believe me, there was no agreement except the agreement that we are Muslims. Every Muslim the moment he says that he is a Muslim, and accepts the example and the precepts of our Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (God's peace and benedictions be upon him) that very moment he agrees to this also, that it is unlawful to enlist or remain in an army which must wage war against and kill Muslims without just cause. And the Resolution passed at the Conference of the Jamiat-ul-Ulama was nothing new that they resolved and declared. What discussion or agreement was required for the Ulama to declare the well-known law of Islam against the killing of Muslims, or to sign a *Fatwa* or juridical pronouncement ? Similarly, what discussion or agreement did the two Muslims, who are our co-accused, need before speaking on the Resolution here? They were asked to declare the Shariat and they did it. What related to the army was not a resolution but a declaration of law. But there was a Resolution, too, a solemn resolve and determination that if the British Government directly or indirectly, secretly or openly takes any hostile action against the Government of Angora, the Muslims of India would be obliged to take to Civil Disobedience in concert with the Congress and to make a declaration at the forthcoming Congress at Ahmedabad in December of Indian Independence and of the establishment of a Republic. Gentlemen, we had provided not only for openly hostile-action against Angora on the part of British but also for secret action, not only for direct British action but also for indirect action through the Greeks. Yes, we know only too well our English diplomacy. At Oxford they define Association and Rugby football in this manner: "Soccer" is a game in which you kick the man if you can't kick the ball. In "Rugger" you kick the ball if you can't kick the man. (Laughter.) In England they want to down every other nation and particularly the Turks. But rule like Rugger is that they will fight themselves only if they can't get another to fight their battle. (Renewed laughter.) Gentlemen, we said that in

the event of reopening of hostilities against the Angora Government, it will be our duty in concert with the Indian National Congress, in concert with our fellow countrymen, to start Civil Disobedience and that if this sort of thing goes on, it will be our duty—a duty of tremendous responsibility—the responsibility of declaring absolute freedom and independence of India, to establish an independent Republic of India. This was not said in a light vein, as a jest or mere bluff. This was a very serious matter indeed. We knew what we were about. Every mother's son among us may be hanged for it. We could have been shot down instead of being brought down to this hall and having this farce of a trial—the judge and the jury and all this paraphernalia—instead of this lengthy circuitous route there could be a short cut—no prosecution, no judge, no jury but only a firing party at dawn led by Col. Gwyer or Col. Beach and a chatter of rifles and there would be an end of the matter.

However, we did declare this and in consideration of that grave matter we determined that in concert with our fellow countrymen we would do either of these two things or both. The prosecution, however, is not for that. It is for the earlier portion of the Resolution which is cited in the order of the Government sanctioning the prosecution. But the previous portion of the Resolution is not stated in its *entirety*. That Resolution says: "This meeting further plainly declare that according to the Islamic *Shariat* it is strictly forbidden to serve or enlist in the British Army or to raise *recruits*." Threrfore the charge is that we declared the Law of Islam and the declaration of the Law of Muslims, if it is an offence, then, gentlemen, say so. In that case, if you declare the law of Christianity that too is an offence. The Hindus following their own religious injunction declared the Hindu Law, that is also an offence. Therefore a number of men who demand from an Indian soldier that he must not kill a cow will be guilty of agreement to commit a criminal offence, that is to say, they will be guilty, of criminal conspiracy. Now I say *if* the declaration is an agreement, if to declare the laws of Islam is an offence and we are guilty, then say so. But this is a matter which the Judge has got to decide, only you will have to give your

opinion as Assessors and it would rest with what you think best. (Laughter.) I think that is the law in regard to assessors also (laughter) always consult your wife, *i.e.*, the assessors, but do what you, the Judge, think best. (Laughter.) Gentlemen, bigamy for an Englishman and a Christian is a crime and even a Muslim can have only four wives. But the Judge in this case has five wives that are to be consulted. (Renewed laughter.) But the Judge will do what he thinks best. I will still appeal to the Judge because he too has a soul to be saved like ours. I make no appeal to him for my own sake. I do not even appeal to the Jury for myself, I appeal to them for their own sake and have said to them, whatever I had got to say in the matter. You will only decide upon the facts before you and let no man say that any outside influence was brought to bear upon your decision.

Now, I come to the charge which is before you as Jury. You are the sole judge hero. You are "Monarch of all you survey" here. I would not like you to disagree in your finding. I hope you will agree whether your verdict be for us or whether you come to a finding against us. But let there be an agreement. Let us not be said that the Hindu Jurors came to this finding and the Christian Jurors came to that. Let it not be said that the gentlemen working in the Greek firm of Ralli Brothers gave this verdict and the gentlemen from Forbes, Forbes and Campbell gave that verdict. You should be united. I prefer that you should be united. I prefer that you should be united in a matter of grave importance like this. Let yourself be guided by your own conscience because that after all is the basic law of all Faiths. You must do the right, you must act according to your conscience. Now, on this matter, I may again tell you, you are the sole monarch and the charge on which you are to give your verdict is the matter of attempt that is under section 131. (Reads the Sections).

The Court. You are charged with being members of a conspiracy which attempted to seduce the troops.

Mohamed Ali: We are charged with being members of a conspiracy, that is to say, charged with having agreed to commit a criminal offence, and in pursuance of that conspiracy, somebody within this conspiracy—some fellow conspirator—attempted

these things. It does not matter whether we ourselves have attempted or some other persons have attempted. True: Well, Mr. Ross Alston of Allahabad, (the Advocate-General of the United Provinces assisting the Public Prosecutor) gets somebody in Allahabad who gets printed somewhere and gets that someone to reproduce something from the Ulama's *Fatwa* although he is perfectly ignorant of the Qur-an. All this has to be carefully done. He gets an ignorant Maulvi to copy it—every Muslim feels and trembles when he has got to copy anything from the Qur'an lest he writes something different and attributes it to God falsely, the Maulvi—copies it, gets it published for Mr. Ross Alston—gets it printed in Allahabad or in Lahore; he gets the same kind of envelopes; the letters are posted from different places, but mostly from Allahabad where Mr. Ross Alston comes from. (Laughter.) And you have got to transport me for life for this. This is the thing which we are supposed to have done. What is the proof? He (the P.P.) says, this is the proof. A poet says, "The appearance of the sun is itself the proof of the sun." So, in this case too, what further proof is needed? Well, the charge is that these leaflets were sent to Muslim soldiers. That they were posted mostly from Allahabad because some were posted from Cawnpore whence Maulana Nasir Ahmad Saheb, one of the accused, comes, the Public Prosecutor attributed them to him and to us. Well, Allahabad is the place where Mr. Ross Alston comes from, the place from which two C.I.D. officers who have deposed against us come—well, from that can you not have this presumption that it is Mr. Ross Alston who did it? (Laughter.) Well, if this thing (showing the leaflet) is sent round is it by itself sufficient for you—as men of any sense--you who are practically business men, is it sufficient for you to transport me for life, to take me away from my children, to take me away from wife, to take me away from my mother, to take me away from my country which is dear to me, to take me away from God's work, simply because they were posted mostly from Allahabad? Is that or is that not the whole offence? Read it for yourselves. Search for it in the entire record of evidence. If you are conscientious your judgment must be right. You who are conscientious men,—you who cannot kill a gnat for nothing, you are not going

to transport six men for life—not six men, for at last we find we are to be seven—our revered friend Jagat Guru Shri Sankaracharya will also go with us Muslims because if there was no evidence against him, it was amply made up after all by the wrath of the perfectly peaceful Public Prosecutor. You saw that *Baresarkar* rage yourself. Not of course, a real storm, mind you, from such a gentleman but a fairly good and imitation of one—a thing of the proseniuism—something just realistic enough to give us the impression that there was a storm at last with lightening and thunder, hail and wind—all this came from my peaceful and amiable friend there. (Laughter.) Are you going to commit all of us on the proof that there are certain envelopes and certain officers from the army who received them; Officers? Euphemism could go no further. Yes, officers of courage in battle and length of service and medals—and those real medals—not of silver hanging on their breasts, but medals of lead, lead bullets that found billets in their bodies and their breasts—so far as these are concerned, really and truly officers, but yet men who have got, even as veterans and heroes of a hundred battle-plains who salute the merest white tyro, the merest callow youth with hardly a moustache on his upper lip but only girlish peach-down because they themselves are brown and black. These are the people who come before you. They come and present before you these things, and say "a most terrible thing has happened." One verse —incorrectly transcribed verse from the Qur'an—was sent to us and even without opening these envelopes we scented that they were smelling gunpowder, smelling of 1857. We rushed to our Officer Commanding and said "Sir, save us from Islam; our feelings are hurt, our religious feelings are hurt. We are being reminded of our religion; we are being reminded of our God. For God's sake protect us from God! Does not Queen's Proclamation give us protection? We are being bombarded with the quotations from the Qur'an! We can stand all bombardments but not this." Is it on this evidence we are going to be transported for life?

But, gentlemen of the Jury, I do not want you to save me. I want you to be saved yourselves. This is the only evidence

and nothing more—not a jot or tittle more than this. If there was any, our friend (the Public Prosecutor) would have told you. He has got to transport seven for life—a large and long transportation indeed! He took four hours in addressing you—practically a whole day and thereby earned a day's fee, although his daily is perhaps greater than the monthly salaries of all you combined (interrupted.)

Mohamed Ali continuing said: Well, gentlemen, this is the main thing for which you have been sworn in as a Jury and taken away from your work—five of you. Well, wherever you may come from, from Ralli Brothers or Forbes, Forbes and Campbell or the Customs House, you are here for that purpose, otherwise only two gentlemen might have been brought in as assessors, as wives of the Judge. (Laughter.) You are self-sufficient. You are the sole judge here as a Jury though there are several other charges—there are sections more than one can number—there are sections 120-B, 117, 505 and so on—for which you act only as assessors. As you may remember, when the policeman asked me when I was being brought to Karachi, under what sections I was charged and I told him of all the charges. He said: Well, they are all home-made sections (laughter) and they can apply as many as they like. So this is the only Jury charge, Section 120-B read with Section 131. This is as regards the leaflet containing an extract from the *Fatwa*. It is the Jamiat-ul-Ulama that signed this *Fatwa*. We are supposed to be very frank people, so we said this in the lower Court as well as in this Court that we were glad that the Jamiat-ul-Ulama were at last doing their duty. The Jamiat-ul-Ulama is supposed to be a party to this conspiracy. But the Government is very moderate. It has picked out only three Ulama for this trial. The Government is astonished at its own moderation as Lord Clive said of his own moderation. Out of the 500 Ulama who signed the *Fatwa* only two or three have been brought here. Well, why have not the others been prosecuted? I thought that the Ulama who had done this would have been here. It is for the first time in my life that I saw this leaflet here. In fact, it was for the first time in my life a little while ago that I came to know of this *Fatwa* of the Jamiat-ul-

Ulama on this matter though I knew of their resolution in their Conference at Delhi. However, it does not matter if I did not know the others who conspired with me did know. That is no protection for me. And I do not seek any. But in this case of attempt in pursuance of the conspiracy I thought the clear conspirators were the Jamiat-ul-Ulama. Whatever the conspiracy is, the Jamiat-ul-Ulama is a party to it and I said that at last the association of the Ulama was doing its religious duty. But I was immediately corrected by my friend, brother-in-law and legal adviser, though not my legal representative in this case—Mr. Muazzam Ali. He said: no, the Jamiat-ul-Ulama too deny the distribution and printing of these leaflets. So I turned round and said in the lower Court: Well, I am not correct myself, but I hope they will soon convert the forgery into a fact.

But it is the fact, gentlemen, that you have got to deal with facts and not with the forgery. Is it a fact that anybody is a member of the conspiracy who does this? This is a presumption and not a fact. Well, gentlemen, clear your heads of all these cobwebs woven by the P. P. It is nothing but throwing dust—good old Karachi dust (laughter)—in your eyes. Nothing more than that.

I now come to Section 505. (Reads it.)

This is wider than Section 131, for I may not even preach to the Imperial Service troops of my own state of Rampur about their religious duty. What would my grandfather who was the "right-hand man" as Government itself testified, of his master, the then Nawab Sahib of Rampur in 1857, and saved hundreds of Englishmen and Englishwomen at the risk of his own life and saved the U P. Government—what would he have thought of this prosecution of his grandsons for declaring to the Rampur Pathans the law of Islam about sparing the lives of Muslims? But that is another story. Well, gentlemen, Col. Beach of the Army Headquarters, Simla, and Lord Macaulay have given me my cue (reads) with intent to cause or which it is likely to cause soldiers to disregard or fail in their duty as such. But what is their duty—the first duty of these soldiers which they must not disregard or fail in? When a child is born

in a family—if there is any faith in that family—the nurse should not say that a boy or a girl is born, but that a new recruit is born in the army of God. That child must be the soldier of Cod. That is why the primeval souls were asked this question by God: "Am I not your Lord ?" and they said "Yes." Gentlemen, I am tempted to recite a verse—a verse of my own —a poor thing but mine own—as Touchstone said, Cinna the poet was killed for Cinna the conspirator, when Cæsar was murdered and the crowds had become mad through Mark Antony's rhetoric: "No, no, I am not Cinna, the conspirator, I am Cinna the poet." But they said, "Then kill him for his bad verses. (Laughter.) Gentlemen, don't transport me for life for my bad verses: I address my own fellow countrymen, my own co-religionists and I say to them—you are being reminded of your duty, you are being reminded of your allegiance, you are being reminded of your loyalty, you have given to Government before your God and man—you are being reminded of your honour and you are asked to be faithful. (Recites a verse.) Kindly carry out that first pledge that you gave to God while you are about it. You are loyal people. A little more loyalty will not be amiss. Can I not say to the Jury—if these people are not true to their God, can they be true to their King? (Pindrop silence prevails in the house)—the God that gave them everything, life, honour, Faith, loyalty itself—the God that has given them—the King! If they are not true to their God, they cannot be true to their King. I say God before eyerything—God before loyalty, God before King, God before patriotism, God before my country, God before my father, mother and child. That is my Faith. Hang me if you like. But having done that, gentlemen, you may commit suicide yourselves also, because then you would have murdered your own souls. You may walk and sit and stand and work. But your bodies would only be moving carcases without souls, fit carrion, to provide food for the crows.

Gentlemen, it is the Government, it is they who want to seduce God's soldiers. We want to bring them back to their pristine loyalty. The law says that in any case there is an ex-

ception: "It does not amount to an offence, within the meaning of this section, when the person making, publishing or circulating any such statement, rumour or report has reasonable ground for believing that such statement, rumour or report is true."

The Court: Read out the whole section, Mr. Mohamed Ali.

Mohamed Ali: I will, sir. I will not leave out one jot or tittle. The Government will have its pound of flesh. In the case of Shylock, they allowed him only the flesh; but they would not let him take a drop of Christian blood. But you can take that too from me, full measure and overflowing.

That exception requires that you establish the truth of the statement or give reasonable ground for your belief in its truth and that made it "without any such intent as aforesaid." "There is no god but the one God and Muhammad is His Prophet." Is that my statement? No, it is the creed of all Muslims. It cannot be an offence to declare that creed even if it is likely to "seduce" a man from his allegiance to a King or Government that demands obedience from him in matters involving disobedience to God. Is it an offence to say so? The next offence is asking ten persons or more to commit a similar offence. But for that too the first question is the question of statement. Whose statement? It is not my statement; it is the statement of God: It is a declaration based on the law of the Qur'an. It is well known to every Muslim who understands the Qur'an. It is not a matter of my own opinion.

Now I want to show what a man is required to do when he joins the army, what is and what is not his duty as a soldier. (Reads) Mark gentlemen, the question is "Are you willing to go wherever ordered by land or sea and allow no caste usage to interfere with your military duty." "Will you do anything which is against your Faith? or will you have any objection when you will be asked to commit a sin?" or "are you willing to go to Hell by land or by sea"? (Laughter.) There is no question like that. The P.P. asked me—he said to me, if somebody believes in human sacrifice and your child is

demanded, you will be the first to seek the protection of the law. In any case, as a non-co-operator in these days, I do not want to seek the protection of the law: neither do I believe that there is any sect that can demand such a sacrifice from other people. The only sect that can demand human sacrifice of other people's children is the sect of the Militarists. They demand it, their Moloch of greed demands it, their Moloch of Imperialism demands it, their greed for dominion demands it, they want that on the high seas—on God's big broad oceans, whenever a foreign ship passes one of their's, it should dip its flag in recognition of the fact that England is "the mistress of the seas." It is these people who want such human sacrifice.

The Judge asked me, "but what about the thief? Do you want that the thief's hand should be cut off?" I said if the Government was an Islamic Government, I would *require* this of it. I would have the adulterer stoned to death too, though adultery is no offence in English law. My bargain as a Muslim with an Islamic Government is different from my bargain as a Muslim with a non-Muslim Government. *From* non-Muslims I do not require that they should do anything for me, except permit me to hold my own religious opinions and act up to them with impunity. My religion can impose its obligation only upon me and not upon others. There is an obligation upon me, to tell God's own truth that it is religiously forbidden to join the British Army and to fight a Muslim without a just cause, and that it is unjust to kill a brother Muslim at the bidding of the Government, which is next to infidelity. The Prophet said the last thing that he said collecting all the people who had gone to the pilgrimage together, some 175 thousand people assembled together at Mina, and the Prophet asked, "What day is it" . . . (interrupted).

The Court: I would ask you to stop. Never mind about the Prophet.

Mohamed Ali (Indignantly): I must mind about the Prophet. I think you should withdraw that.

Shaukat Ali: Blasphemy and impertinence;

Mohamed Ali: You must withdraw that. You must make amends. I have get to mind about the Prophet. I have to take a man's life who insults the Prophet.

The Court: You must stop. You cannot go on.

Mohamed Ali: I am doing what the law allows me. The law says that I am not to seduce troops from their duty. I say it is not a part of a Muslim soldier's duty to kill a brother Muslim. And I am here entitled to argue this till eternity. So long as I want to explain my position, I have this right. Take away this right and end this farce. What is the use of this farce? Take out a shooting party and shoot us out of hand, or if you prefer to keep up this farce of a trial try us after our death, as Lord Nelson once did. I say that no man is required to go against his religion—military duty does not inculcate this.

The Court: It is irrelevant.

Mohamed Ali: I am explaining what my religion says—I have given it in my statement in the lower Court. It is perfectly relevant.

The Court: Sit down.

Mohamed Ali: I have not yet done with Section 505 and have not even touched the charge under Section 117 against me. I have not said one word about that. Am I to be punished without saying one word about it?

The Court: I will not give you the right of speech.

Mohamed Ali: Will you show me a single sentence in your law book that the Judge has the power to take away that right? You have already taken away one of my rights by not allowing me to make a statement before the Prosecution addressed to the Jury. Your own Bombay High Court says that and the Public Prosecutor agrees. I do not know if the Judicial Commissioner of Sind has laid down another law. Now you are going to stop me again from addressing the Jury. You can object to a particular part of my address. You can say—do not say this. But I cannot understand how you can stop me altogether by saying that you will not allow me to say anything more. (The Court kept on saying "sit down, I won't hear you."

Mohamed Ali: I am explaining that it is not the law, that it is no part of a Muslim's duty to go against his religion. Have I not got to prove that this statement contained in the resolution is a true statement and not a false statement? Is it relevant?

The Court: It is not relevant.

Mohamed Ali: Do you think that you are authorised by law to take that right from me? The law says it does not amount to an offence within the meaning of the exception again.

The Court: ...and."

Mohamed Ali: Never mind about "and." I am arguing that it is a true statement. I am not yet arguing about the intention.

The Court: I do not want to hear you.

Mohamed Ali: It is for the Assessors; at any rate you cannot take away the Assessor-' right. They will have to give their opinion about this whether I am guilty or not. It is according to law. And the law says this (reads again). I cannot take your word for it. I cannot really. I cannot take any man's word as against the clear provision of the law.

The Court: Argue your case.

Mohamed Ali: It is not your case that I am arguing. (Laughter.) Well, gentlemen of the Jury—(interrupted).

The Court: I do not want to hear you.

Mohamed Ali: You may not hear me as you have done on many other occasions. You have slept through a great deal of evidence that was being read out. You may sleep now. But I have got to address the Jury.

The Court: (With apparent anger). Will you sit down?

Mohamed Ali: If I don't?

The Court: I shall put you in custody.

Mohamed Ali: Do!

(The Superintendent of Police was here called to make the

accused sit down but retired without touching him, leaving him standing.

The Court directed the Serishtadar to call accused No. 2 Maulana Husain Ahmed Sahib. The Serishtadar approaching called out, but Maulana Husain Ahmad did not utter a single word or budge an inch.

Mohamed Ali: (Not minding this interruption). Now, gentlemen of the Jury.

The Court: Do not interrupt the Court.

Mohamed Ali: I am not interrupting the Court. Rather you are interrupting me. I have got to argue regarding this exception. I have got to deal with this. Take away the charges under Sections 505 and 117 against me if you can and I shall stop. You have got the power to amend the charge up to the last.

The Court: I cannot allow you to discuss religious law here.

Mohamed Ali: There is no question of religious law. I am arguing about the law of the land, as you call it. I have got to show to the Assessors that this declaration of statement contained in the resolution is true because it is based on the Qur'an and the Hadith.

The Court: There is no necessity of it.

Mohamed Ali: It is I who have got to consider the necessity, not you. You had no right to stop the Prosecution witnesses. You could not have stopped them unless you said that their evidence was inadmissible. You did not stop the Public Prosecutor. He was to prove what he thought was necessary. But you will not allow me to prove what I think is necessary; to prove that it is a true statement of Muslim Law that I laid down, that it is *haram* to serve in the army. I have got to prove that from the Qur'an and the Hadith, material or immaterial, I have got to do it and I am to do it from the Islamic Law. I have got to take my law from the Qur'an and from the King. The King gives me protection for following the Qur'an's law in those Proclamations. That is the King's law.

If you do not obey that, then why is the King's portrait over there (pointing to the portrait of King Edward hung upon the wall). I have got to take my law from this King. I have got my statement based on the King's law. I do not want to create a scene. I am not here for that purpose. I have not shown disrespect to you even though I could not show any respect to the Court as part of Government. I don't want to be obstinate and cheeky. But I cannot have my right brushed aside.

The Court : But you take so much time.

Mohamed Ali: Yesterday you sent me word that you will give me half an hour more to-day to discuss the supremacy of religious law before I come to the legal point and the facts of the case. I have already finished with that. I say that religion was to be an exception in every case. Now, dealing with the law of the land, Section 505, I have got to prove that it is religiously forbidden to serve in the army, that it is a true statement and therefore I come under the exception to Section 505.

The Court : Suppose it is accepted that it is a true statement.

Mohamed Ali : Let the Assessors accept it. Let them give it to me in writing. Will they give it to me that this is considered to be proved? Tell me that this is proved—that my statement is true. I will go on. Then I will not argue one word more about it. Ask the Public Prosecutor whether I have got the right or not.

Public Prosecutor: We admit that the passages cited in his statement before the lower Court are in the Qur'an.

Mohamed Ali: I want you to admit more than that. I want you to admit that this statement for which I am charged under Section 505 is in accordance with the Qur'an and the Hadith.

Public Prosecutor : We can't admit that.

Mohamed Ali ; If you won't admit I have got to prove it. Supposing a Christian is charged for making a statement of his belief in God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost. He says that he has got to prove that that is the Christian belief

and a true statement. He says, "I will show it from the Bible, I will show it from the Epistles—I will show it from the Gospels—I will show it from the Prayer Book, will he not be entitled to do that? Will I, a Muslim, be a fair judge? Do you think it will be fair of me not to allow him to prove that this is a correct statement of the Christian Trinitarian's Faith?

The Court: (nodding his head). Sit down.

Mohamed Ali: I cannot sit unless you admit that my statement is true. I should like to say one thing. I really do not want to be obstinate. I do not want to be needlessly importunate, out of sheer cussedness and ill-will against the Court. I do not want to show any disrespect to you. This does not tally with any part of my character as an accused person or as a Non-co-operator. But at the same time I want to stand on my right.

The Court: You are wasting the Court's time.

Mohamed Ali: I am not-wasting anybody's time. I just want to convince the Jury that the statement is a true statement.

The Court: It matters not.

Mohamed Ali: It matters a great deal to me. It matters much so far as I am concerned. It matters a great deal to prove to the gentlemen of the Jury that this is in accordance with the Qur'an and Hadith and that I did not fabricate it. I may have made a false statement. Supposing I commit a rape and I come in before the Court and I say that my religion allows it. You can say, "show it to me from your religious law." You will not take my word for it and you will have to allow me to prove it. What is it after all? I am not asking for protection for a murder that I have committed. I am not asking for protection for arson that I have committed nor am I seeking protection for loot. Loot becomes sacred when the Army Commander orders it. Murder is no murder when the Army Commander commands it. In my case, too, when the Qur'an commands, murder is no murder. So when I referred to the Qur'an you can say "show it to me."

The Court: Suppose we admit it for argument's sake.

Mohamed Ali: I want it to be admitted for all purposes. I

may not argue on word about the intention. Gentlemen, I am not speaking in my defence. But I must prove that this was a correct statement. I had the same difficulty with my friend Mr. Montague, who said, "Far be it from me, Mr. Mohamed Ali, to intervene in a discussion about your religion." I said to him, "Please do. Let us discuss it." And I was actually in tears before him when I told him it is no pleasure to me to be against his Government. He respected those tears. I explained the religious law about the Khilafat and the Jazirat-ul-Arab and he had to listen. I had to explain my religion to Mr. Lloyd George also and to some other members of the Cabinet and they had not said that they had nothing to do with the Qur'an.

I want to prove that this is a correct statement and you must not take away my right to prove it. Will you allow it?

The Court: If you will only do it in a very short way. (The whole house burst into peals of laughter at the Judge's relaxing at long last.)

Mohamed Ali: (To the Court). Why did you not say so before? Of course, I will do it in a short way—in fact in a very short way.

Gentlemen, I do not know whether a man is exempted or not in the army from observing his caste usages. This form includes merely a question about them and we do not know what happens to the intending recruit who wishes to observe them. Dante wrote in his *Inferno* and Milton quotes it in his *Paradise Lost* also, that this legend is inscribed over the gate of Hell: "Whosoever enters here must leave all hope behind." So it should be written over the portals of the British Indian Army: "Whosoever enters this must leave all Faith behind." On a famous occasion the German Chancellor had said: "Necessity knows no law" and those who execrate this lawless doctrine are being punished as law-breakers. What we want is that Government should be straightforward and honest about it. At present people go to the Army apparently with their eyes shut. We ask that they join the Army knowing very well that their religious law, and its obligations on them will not be respected, but would be sacrificed to the Moloch of Military exigencies and that one

Queen's Proclamation and two Kings, Proclamations will afford them no protection, nobody will then blame the Government. All the sin would be those people's who knew all this and yet joined the army. But what is it after all that Islamic law demands to-day? For what offence does it seek the secular law's protection? Not for human sacrifice! I do not say "shoot your officers—kill them." No, on the contrary I demand that they be not guilty of the human sacrifice of their Muslim brothers—of fratricide. When you took them to fight the Germans on the outbreak of the war, I did not say, "Do not" fight with them. I do not say, if there is disorder in Karachi and Muslims are rioting, that Muslim soldiers should not go and stop that. In this form (showing the form of Enlishmen) all sorts of questions are asked. The form says, "the following 9 questions" but there are really 14 and not 9 questions in all (Reads all the questions). I do not know what happens if he says he is unwilling to be vaccinated or even to be revaccinated—as some Hindus may well do on account of the vaccine or lymph from the cow. The solemn declaration of the intending recruit only says that the answers are true and that he is willing to fulfil the engagements made without explaining what they are. But let us presume that he has expressed his willingness to be vaccinated and to go wherever ordered by land or sea and allow no caste usage to interfere with his military duty and that these are the engagements. But whereas the 15th question, which should have been: "Are you willing to do anything you are ordered and allow no religious commandment to interfere with your military duty? Are you willing to forego your religion?" Where is such a question in the form? If the man says "yes" then it is all right, and if he refuses, you can chuck him out. But you don't ask him this question, you dare not do that—seducing from duty. As I have already said, we are teaching him his first duty—that his first duty is to God and the second duty is to his country and his King. Gentlemen of the Jury, the Proclamation came, as you know, after the greased cartridges affair and the mutiny, and it was to repudiate precisely this unlimited connotation of military duty that it was issued in 1858. But what is the tearing with one's teeth of greased cartridges or eating a whole pig compared

to the sin of killing a Muslim? I have already stated in my statement in the lower Court and I repeat it that if a man is threatened with death unless he consents to take pork, he may not only take it, but must and if he is killed on account of refusal to do so, he dies a sinner. In like circumstances he may even declare that he is a Kafar if he continues to be a believer, at heart, though it is preferable not to do so, and if he is killed on account of refusal, he dies a martyr. But in like circumstances he must not kill or dismember another Muslim but patiently submit to be killed instead. And you dare not ask a Muslim to touch cartridges with pigs' grease as part of military duty since your experience of 1857 and the Proclamation of 1858 and yet you call it part of military duty to kill Muslims which is far worse than eating pork and worse even than outward apostasy. The absence of such a question as I have suggested means that the Government understood what it would lead to. We consider it a part of duty therefore to remind the Muslim soldier of his duty to God, to demand from a Muslim that he must carry out his God's law. That is not seducing him from doing his duty in the army and in any case, he need not desert or fail in his duty but appeal to Government through his superior officers that such duty as is against his religion may not be required of him. There is, therefore, neither a likelihood nor an intention of seducing a soldier from his duty as such.

Gentlemen of the Jury, I am not anxious to get off. I am not anxious for my defence. I make no defence whatsoever, though I had to explain the law of Islam to you and explain the bearing of that on the position we have taken up. If have not cross-examined witnesses nor produced evidence on my own side. But I want you who are mostly my countrymen, though co-operating with this Government, to consider this. You will find that in the history of the world many celebrated trials have taken place and many great people have been declared guilty of many offences. In English history itself even poor Joan of Arc was killed for a witch. But with what result? Her golden statue stood before my hotel in France and while I was there the Catholic Church led by the Pope and the College of

Cardinals canonised her and what did the successors of those who had burnt her do? Why the British army joined the French in honouring her memory and in placing wreaths on her statue? I was present at such a scene. George Washington was a wicked rebel in the time of George III. What is the verdict of the British Government to-day? He is the greatest patriot!

I should like to address a remark or two particularly to the solitary Englishman on the Jury. Englishmen are not bound to follow the majority of their countrymen, particularly in unrighteousness and injustice. Believe me throughout English history it has been the minority that was mostly in the right, and at any rate it was the minority that began great and good movements. A great cause had never been started in the world's history by the majority. It was not Pilate that was crucified. It was Christ (God's peace and blessings be on him). Pilate was the Judge who pronounced the verdict against Christ! But who pronounces the verdict now and who will pronounce it hereafter? On the last day—the Day of Judgment, it is God who will pronounce the sentence on Pilate who did not know what was truth, and ask that famous or infamous question so cynically. But where is Pilate now? Who ever remembers him—the great crucifying judge, except for Christ's crucification? Now to millions of human beings Christ is the Saviour. But who am I, an humble individual to compare myself with Christ, I who am not worthy even to take the dust off the feet of Christ! But as the poet has said:

> Weakness never need be falseness,
> Truth is Truth in each degree,
> Thunder pealed by God to Nature,
> Whispered by my soul to me.

And in the thunder peals of British howitzers the still small voice of an humble man's soul has whispered into his ear this little bit of truth—God's eternal, everlasting soul—sustaining Truth—that he must not stand by and see Muslims being slaughtered by Muslims in spite of God's clear law, but must preach against it and propagate God's Truth, unshaken by fear of man and untroubled by mundane consequences.

Gentlemen, take another case—the case of the martyrs of Karbala. The Prophet's grandson had only 72 men and Yazid's army had thousands and they killed him. He was then in a small minority. But for thirteen hundred years the mourning for that vile deed—the deed of the Government in power—has been going on. Every Muslim mourns for Husain—Husain the victim and not for Yazid the proud victor, and many Muslim cities have a quarter just outside known as Karbala, while not a trace of Yazid's grave can be found anywhere. So, gentlemen, do not think of the consequences of your verdict to-day or tomorrow, but of its ultimate consequences here to human freedom and hereafter, in another world. And you have got to judge for yourself. Ralli Brothers cannot judge for you. Forbes, Forbes and Compbell who objected to a small white Gandhi cap cannot judge for you. Mr. Lloyd George cannot judge for you. God on His Judgment Day will ask Lloyd George about his soul, not about yours, and he may have much to answer for. God will ask you about your individual soul and none of others. And if as a Hindu you believe only in punishment in this very world through the cycle of transmigration of souls, you must remember that according to your belief, God's Judgment will be visited upon here and not hereafter and you will be judged the moment your soul quits its abode in your body and seeks another. Whatever your creed, your Karma is your own, the final judgment does not rest with you any more than with the Judge there but with God, the Lord of all the worlds.

Gentlemen, I have taken much of your time, far more than I had intended to take or would have taken were it not for being constantly interrupted and stopped. But as I said at the very outest, had it been a case of my individual defence or of all of us accused together only, I would not have argued at such length and with such persistence. I do not seek to avoid punishment for the jail is the gateway to India's freedom. Had I sought to avoid the entire Prosecution and to prove my case according to the canons of this very law, the so-called law of the land, I could have cross-examined the witnesses and torn their evidence to shreds. I was really tempted to do that in the

case of Col. Gwyer with his enlistment forms and his "soldier's duty as such." I think I may say this though I do not pretend to be a big lawyer like my friend the Public Prosecutor or his little assistant. Nevertheless, the case is so hopelessly weak that it could not keep us shut up in the jail for a day even if the ex-Lord Chief Justice of England himself, better known as Rufus Isaacs, K.C., had his Government's brief. But although a Non-co-operator and therefore debarred from my duty as such to defened myself I had to speak up when the Viceroy indulged in his hill-top *obiter dicta* on a matter which he knew and admitted was *sub judice*. He said that this was no case of an attack on Islam or religious interference. What could be a more flagrant case of both?

If the tallest poppies are to be cut off for unfolding Islam and its laws and you ask those who remain what is your opinion about the law of Islam, which only means your turn next if you dare to tell the truth "and you cut off their heads too if they still dare, the result may well be that there will be none to stand up and oppose your will. And then you will say "we interfere not with your faiths." If this is non-interference, you can enjoy the self-complacence induced by such boasts of toleration. But that is not all. We are asked to look at him—the tallest poppy of the Israelite garden in England—as upon a certificate of British toleration. But, gentlemen, I cannot imitate the ex-Lord Chief Justice of England and Viceroy of India. His law is a law unto him and my law is a law unto me. The example of his people, if I may say so without offence, is constantly mentioned in the Qur'an for the Muslim to avoid and take heed from. According to the Qur'an, after Moses (on whom be God's peace and blessings) had brought the Israelites safely out of Egypt and they had been delivered from the tyranny of Pharaoh, they were asked to march on to the Promised Land. But they said, "it is ruled by giants, we shall never be able to enter it so long as they are there," and they said to Moses, "Go thou and thy God, and fight them—we are the while sitting here."

Well, gentlemen, that's not an example that I am asked to

follow in the case of my Holy land. So far as I am concerned, the Qur'an is my law, giants or no giants, and I shall fight when my God demands it of me and shall not rest, nor ask Him to fight the giants Himself. And if I am to be hanged for it—for it is not Section 120-A or B then, but 121, waging war against the King, gentlemen, I will still say that this is my law and that it is right and even my carcass hanging from the gibbet, will say the same! Do not therefore think of saving me, gentlemen, from transportation for life. But if you have a God and if you have a soul to save and you have faith, you will decide according to your conscience. You are not to consider whether you are servants of a particular company of the Greek firm of Ralli Brothers - or Forbes, Forbes and Campbell—of the Customs Office—you are to think nothing of that, but only of this that you are slaves and servitors of God. Gentlemen, this is the one important matter. So just according to *your* conscience it is not to save me but to save yourselves. When the Judge had said, "I cannot allow this" and wanted to stop me, I said to him—"then why not stop this *farce* and hang me outright." Well, he smiled and replied that it was not only a matter between him and me, but also between him and the public and I had replied that the public had already given their verdict within this hall and also in the streets where they crowd in their thousands and cheer us *going* and coming and the old women in spite of their purdah come out—as my own mother had done since this trial and make signs to us indicating that they want to take off our troubles. Well, gentlemen, my defence is before my God and my fellow-countrymen. Here we are now at the bar of this Court as prisoners and accused persons. But when before the judgment-seat of God, the Judge, the Jury, the accused, all the co-accused, the P.P. and his assistant, the King himself—everybody is assembled and God asks, "whose is dominion to-day"—what will be your answer? You will say, "Thine Kingdom! Thine the Dominion." You pray now, "May thy Kingdom come!" But, gentlemen, His kingdom has come. God's Kingdom has come. God's Kingdom is here even to-day. It is not the kingdom of King George, but God's and you must decide on that basis and I must act on that assumption. That

is why I say I will follow the law of King George so long as he does not force me to go against the law of my God. I have no personal malice against him, I have none even against the Judge here, nor against the Government. Not a single instance of that can be quoted from my public speeches. No, gentlemen, we must act from motives of public good, not of private malice. Once the Prophet's son-in-law, cousin and successor, Hazrat Ali was enraged against a Jew who had insulted Islam and the God of Islam and the Faith of Islam, and Ali had jumped on top of him. The Jew thought that he was going to be killed and in sheer desperation spat on Ali's face. You have seen, have you not, a vessel full of milk on the fire and about to boil over and you have seen how it subsides the moment a little could water is poured in. The Jew's spitting acted just in that manner and strangely enough the wrath of Ali subsided at once and he left the Jew and walked away. But the Jew was so astonished at this unexpected turn of events that he ran after Ali and caught hold of him and said, "This is very strange. When I said a word, you forced me down and would have killed me, and when I spat on your face in desperation, you leave me!" And Ali answered: "You insulted God and I could have killed you, but when you spat on me I got enraged on my own account, and personal ill-will could not go well with public duty. I could be an executioner for the sake of God but not a murderer for Ali." Gentlemen, we two bear the revered name of Ali and I have also the name of another even greater than Ali. I will not be a party to the killing even of a goat for personal malice but for the sake of my God I will kill all. I will not spare any one – I will slaughter my own brother, my dear aged mother, wife, children and all for the sake of God, so help me God!" (And as he said this his voice failed him, drops of tears rolled down his cheeks and he sat down completely overcome.)

TO THE NATION

Presidential Address delivered at the Indian National Congress at Cocanada on 26th December, 1923.

VI

TO THE NATION

IT has been the custom for every occupant of the Presidential chair of the Indian National Congress to thank the delegates that have conferred on him the highest honour it is in the power of the Indian nation to confer on an Indian. It has also been customary for him to disclaim that his merits deserved such signal honour and to declare his unfitness to rank with those that had previously occupied the Presidential chair. I have no doubt that the innate modesty of my predecessors infused into these disclaimers and declarations a sincerity that saved them from the banality of mere conventions. But it is no such modesty that makes me further stale them by repetition. When two years ago, just on the eve of my imprisonment, a few of the Provinces had honoured me also with their nominations, I was still in a position to withdraw my name and to give at least partial expression to the shock of surprise I felt on that occasion. This time, however, fate had taken the matter almost entirely out of my hands; for soon after I was discharged from prison, I received from the Reception Committee here the telegraphic message that in a few days it would meet to put the seal of its agreement on the choice of the Provincial Congress Committees.

Believe me, if the circumstances that had led to the Special Session at Delhi, and, still more, if that session itself had not revealed to me conditions that made the withdrawal of my name something in the nature of desertion, I would have withdrawn it even at that late stage. I consider it a presumption to preside here, and one reason for my reluctance and hesitation must be obvious to all. It must be remembered that my association with the Indian National Congress is of very recent date. It was only in 1919 that for the first time I attended the

Congress as a delegate, and then, too, my participation was not in the ordinary course. As some of you may remember, my brother and I had just been released from confinement as State Prisoners in the Betul gaol in which our internment during the last four years of the War had culminated. We had, of course, proceeded straight to the Congress that had alreadly commenced its session in martyred Amritsar, and since we could not have been elected as delegates in the usual way, the good people of Amritsar had forthwith adopted us as their own. The Nagpur Session that was held in the following year was the first, and, as it happened, also the only one previous to this which my brother and I attended as delegates elected in the ordinary course. Those who had hitherto occupied the Presidential chair had been veterans that had grown grey in the service of the Congress. Can it, therefore, be merely conventional if one who is after all among the babes and sucklings of the Congress thanks you for such an unusual mark of your favour?

The only consideration which could justify this favour was that, although my association with the Congress was recent, it was coupled with my association with one of the very greatest, if also one of the latest Congressmen, one whom all eyes search in vain in this Pandal to-day. Ever since I first attended a session of the Congress as a delegate in 1919, his had been the one dominating personality. More than ever we need our great chief Mahatma Gandhi to-day; and if God has willed that in his place one of his humblest followers, though not the least loving among them, should assist you in your deliberations, I can only feel what the Arab poet felt when he wistfully wrote:

"The death of great ones made us great!"

But although the man who was most responsible for Mahatma Gandhi's incarceration hoped that by burying him alive, as he called it, he would kill the spirit that the Mahatma had infused into the nation, I feel certain that it lives just as surely as the Mahatma lives himself. Relying on God's assistance, and on your own kind indulgence, which, I think, I may with confidence bespeak, I invoke that spirit to-day, in the hope that with its aid I may prove not altogether unworthy of the high

office to which your suffrage has all too generously called me.

Friends, the only one who can lead you is the one who had led you at Amritsar, at Calcutta, at Nagpur and at Ahmedabad, though each session of the Congress had its own elected President. Our generalissimo it to-day a prisoner of war in the hands of the enemy, and none can fill the void that his absence from our midst has caused. As for myself, I am but a comrade whom your loving kindness has called out from the ranks, and I plead for its continuance not only during the discussions of this session, but also throughout the year in which I am required by your constitution to assist you as your President.

On one point, however, you too are entitled to an assurance from me, and I offer it to you without hesitation. I have been a fighter all my life, and, of course, I have been in the habit of throwing all the vehemence of an impulsive and impetuous nature into my fights. But your choice of me as your President has robbed me of my freedom, and to regain that freedom, if for nothing else, I would have willingly foregone the great privilege of presiding on this occasion. However, in the cast you have assigned to me the unfamiliar role of the peacemaker, and even a fighter like me has to confess that, if anything is better than a fight, it is peace.

THE MUSLIMS AND THE CONGRESS : THE EFFECT OF THE MUTINY ON THE MUSLIMS

I have referred to the fact that my association with the Congress is of very recent date; but this admission is not merely personal. It involves the political history of the community to which I belong, and if I give a brief outline of it to you, it is only for the purpose of elucidating a problem which is the most vital of all the problems we have to solve to-day. When, in 1885, some Indian leaders, assisted by their British sympathisers, founded the Indian National Congress, the Muslims of India did not participate in the movement except in a few individual cases. If their lack of Western education made them

unfit to take part in a movement essentially that of the classes educated according to Western notions, their political temper made them an element that was not unlikely to prove dangerous to any political movement. They had already loss the rule of India, but the tradition of that rule had survived. This had increased the aversion they had always felt for the new type of education. The rule of India had finally passed from Muslim into English hands by slow and hardly perceptible degrees in the hundred years that intervened between the battle of Plassey and the Indian Mutiny; but the Muslims had not ceased to regard the new rulers of India as something very inferior to themselves in civilisation and culture. This storm of ill will and disdain had been gathering force for a whole century, and was at last precipitated in 1857. The Mutiny began near Calcutta as an affair of the Indian Army, but in the storm-centre of Delhi and of my own Province, where it had to be fought out if English rule was to continue in India, it soon attracted to itself many forms of discontent, and religion was inextricably mixed up with politics. Although so many Muslims had, at enormous risk to themselves, assisted the British at a time when hardly anyone could have predicted their eventual success with any degree of assurance, it was the Musilm aristocracy in those parts that suffered most from the terrible aftermath of the Mutiny. In fact, in its permanent results, even more than in some of its terrors, it could, without any great exaggeration, be compared to the social upheaval that the French Revolution meant to the old nobility of France. The remnants of Muslim aristocracy, deprived of all influence and of many of its possessions, certainly did not expect the return of Muslim rule. Nevertheless, a whole generation of Muslims kept sullenly aloof from all contact with the culture of the new rulers of India which in their heart of hearts they still despised. They were in no mood to take advantage of the education provided by the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, founded in the very year in which the Mutiny convulsed the regions which formed the political centre of Muslim India. It was a natural consequence of this attitude of Muslims who sulked in their tents that when, nearly thirty years

later, a new generation of Indians, who owed their education to the English, inaugurated a political movement on Western lines, Indian Muslims should be unfit by lack of such education to participate in that movement. Nevertheless, the Congress which called itself "Indian" and "National" felt the need of Muslim participation, for it could not justify its title without it.

SYED AHMAD KHAN OPPOSES MUSLIM PARTICIPATION

Efforts were therefore made early enough to enlist Muslims as delegates. But at this juncture Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, the great pioneer of Western education among Muslims, stepped into the political arena, and in two historic speeches, one delivered at Lucknow on the 28th December, 1887, and the other at Meerut on the 16th March, 1888, decisively checked whatever signs the Muslims had shown of political activity in support of the Congress movement. It is by no means a difficult task to criticise those speeches, for they contained many fallacies to which no politically minded Muslim could subscribe to-day. But I am not one of those who declare, merely on the strength of some ill-advised expressions characteristic of so militant a controversialist as Syed Ahmad Khan, that he was opposed to the co-operation of Hindus and Muslims.

THE TRUE NATURE AND MOTIVES OF HIS OPPOSITION

Although his own public career after retirement from Public Service was identified with a movement for the uplift of his own community, he was a good Indian as well as a good Muslim, and many of his speeches prove him to have been an ardent patriot inspired with the love of Indian unity. And those who knew him personally can testify to the staunchness of his friendship with many Hindus, which could not have survived the narrow prejudices of which he has sometimes been accused.

No more true is the charge that he was opposed to Muslim

participation in politics for all time. Whatever arguments he may have used in the two political utterances to which I have referred, to convince his Muslim hearers, there were two arguments, and two only, that had obviously convinced Syed Ahmad Khan himself of the undesirability of Muslim participation in the Congress at the time. He realised to the full that nothing would suit the temper of the Muslims of his day better than the vocation of critics of their British supplanters in the governance of India; and he also realised that such a pursuit would be as dangerous to the continuance and progress of a peaceful political movement like the Congress as it was easy. This was the first argument that impelled Syed Ahmad Khan to keep his community under restraint in politics. The second argument was no less potent. The Muslims must educate themselves if they desired the uplift of their community, and yet it *was no easy task to reconcile Muslims to Western education* even in an institution of their own, which unlike Government colleges and schools, would not divorce religious from secular learning. The easy pursuit of a policy in which the Muslims could act as destructive critics of the hated infidel Government was sure to offer superior attractions to the dull and drab constructive programme of the educationalist, and he therefore set himself to oppose all diversion of Muslim activities into the more attractive, but for the time being less useful, political channel. Reviewing the actions of a bygone generation to-day when it is easier to be wise after the event, I must confess I still think the attitude of Syed Ahmad Khan was eminently wise, and much as I wish that some things which he had said should have been left unsaid, I am constrained to admit that no well-wisher of Muslims, nor of India as a whole, could have followed a very different course in leading the Muslims.

Be it remembered that the man who enunciated this policy was not at the time a *persona grata* to the major portion of the community which he sought to lead. He was hated as a heretic because of the heterodoxy of his aggressive rationalism in interpreting the Holy Quran, and his militant opposition to popular superstitions believed in by the bulk of the orthodox

and to shackling customs consecrated by time, though wholly unauthorised by Islam. He was abused and vilified by hundreds of thousands of his co-religionists, and for long the college that he had founded at Aligarh was the *bete noire* of the pious Muslim. And yet the entire community followed his political lead without a murmur. Neither fallacious arguments nor even political clap-trap could have possessed such potency, and it is my firm belief that his advocacy succeeded mainly because of the soundness of the policy advocated.

For two decades thereafter the Muslims had hardly any politics or any political institution worth the name. On important occasions when Syed Ahmad Khan, and, of course, his British supporters, thought that any demand of the Congress it satisfied would not be productive of good for the Muslims, he would call together a few of his friends, mostly Trustees of the Aligarh College, who used to form a society bearing some such name as the "Muslim Defence Association," and a resolution of this body would be published in the *Pioneer* and in Syed Ahmad Khan's own local weekly newspaper in due course. That was all that the Muslims would do in those days in the field of politics.

I am far from denying that Syed Ahmad Khan knew perfectly well that his policy was more than acceptable to his official supporters, who would have in all likelihood put every possible obstruction in the way of his College and his Educational Conference if he had followed another less acceptable to them. But a very close study of his character leads me to declare that he was far from possessing the sycophancy with which some of his political critics have credited him. Indeed, even the opportunism of which his policy savoured could not have been entirely palatable to a nature so independent as his. In the year 1907, soon after the commencement of a new era in Muslim politics inaugurated by the foundation of the Muslim League, to which I shall presently refer, there occurred a strike of the students of Syed Ahmad Khan's College at Aligarh, owing to the support given against them by their own English Principal and Professors to the police that had picked

up a quarrel with one of them. Just about that time fell the anniversary of Syed Ahmad Khan's death celebrated annually in the College as the "Founder's Day." For that occasion I had written in Urdu an Ode addressed to the late Founder of my College, and referring to this unmistakable indication of the students' self-respect and of their willingness to make the necessary self-sacrifice demanded by the haughty disdain of the foreigner, I had said:

سکھایا تھا تمہیں نے قوم کو یہ شور و شر سارا
جو اسکی انتہا ہم ہیں تو اسکی ابتدا تم ہو

(It is you that had taught the community all this "mischief"; if we are its culmination, you are its commencement.)

"THE ARCH-REBEL"

That I am not alone in this estimate of Syed Ahmad Khan's character and policy will be proved by an interesting conversation that I shall relate. Once when my brother was still in the Public Service, an old English official asked him who he thought was the greatest rebel in India against British rule. And, correcting my brother's answer, that experienced official had declared that it was no other than Syed Ahmad Khan, loyalist of loyalists! When my brother protested against this astonishing judgment, he said: "Do you think young Muslims who are being taught at Aligarh almost as well as our own boys at Harrow and Winchester, who live their lives and can beat them at their own games, would obsequiously serve them when they come out as Indian Civilians or members of such other superior services. No, Mr. Shaukat Ali, the days of British rule in India are numbered, and it is your loyal Syed Ahmad Khan that is the arch-rebel to-day!"

Like only too many of us, this British official too had failed to realise the paralysing effect of the education given in the colleges and schools established or favoured by this foreign Government, and had only foreseen the dissatisfaction and discontent that it must inevitably produce. With a Muslim

University, chartered, aided and controlled by Government still flourishing at Aligarh, so far as the numbers of the teachers and the taught and a University Chest filled with the contributions of the rich are concerned, though robbed of all generous ideals and national and communal ambitions, and existing side by side with another, poor in everything save its ideals and its dreams, into which my old college had seemed to have transformed itself three years ago, I cannot boast that the "arch-rebel" of Aligarh has altogether succeeded in his "rebellious" endeavour. But it is my firm conviction that he had always aimed and intended to produce staunch Muslims and patriotic Indians even if he could not perhaps contemplate a near enough future for India in which his "young barbarians all at play" could be other than "loyal British subjects."

ALIGARH AND THE MUSLIM LEAGUE

Nearly thirty years after the foundation of the Universities in the three Presidency towns of India—a period which corresponds with the growth of a new generation—the Congress had inevitably come into existence. It was no easy task that Syed Ahmad Khan had accomplished in founding an Anglo-Oriental College of his own community within two decades of the Indian Mutiny in the very regions which had formed the storm-centre in 1857. In obedience, as it were, to a law of nature, once more nearly thirty years after the foundation of this College, there came into being a political institution of the Muslims who had not availed themselves of the educational facilities provided by the State Universities, and could not consequently share in the political awakening which those Universities had indirectly brought about. And it is not without significance that fairly prominent among the founders of the Muslim League at Dacca at the end of 1906 were some alumni of Syed Ahmad Khan's own College.

This inaugurated a new era in the political life of the Indian Muslims. Some months previously a Muslim Deputation had waited at Simla on the Viceroy, Lord Minto to place before him

and his Government a statement of the Muslim demands in connection with the Minto-Morley Reforms then foreshadowed. To follow the fashion of British journalists during the War, "there is no harm *now* in saying" that the Deputation's was a "command" performance! It was clear that Government could no longer resist the demands of educated Indians, and, as usual, it was about to dole out to them a morsel that would keep them gagged for some years. Hitherto the Muslims had acted very much like the Irish prisoner in the dock who, in reply to the judge's inquiry whether he had any counsel to represent him in the trial, had frankly replied that he had certainly not engaged counsel, but that he had "friends in the jury"! But now the Muslims' "friends in the jury" had themselves privately urged that the accused should engage duly qualified counsel like all others. From whatever source the inspiration may have come, there is no doubt that the Muslim cause was this time properly advocated. In the common territorial electorates the Muslims had certainly not succeeded in securing anything like adequate or real representation, and those who denounced and deplored the creation of separate electorates for which the Muslims had pleaded should have remembered that separate electorates were the consequence, and *not* the cause, of the separation between Muslims and their more numerous Hindu brethren.

SEPARATE ELECTORATES HASTEN INDIAN UNITY

But little could the official supporters of the Muslim community have suspected at the time that, paradoxical as it may seem, the creation of separate electorates was hastening the advent of Hindu-Muslim unity. For the first time a real franchise, however restricted, was being offered to Indians, and if Hindus and Muslims remained just as divided as they had hitherto been since the commencement of British rule, and often hostile to one another, mixed electorates would have the best battle-ground for inter-communal strifes, and would have still further widened the gulf separating the two communities Each.

candidate for election would have appealed to his own community for votes, and would have based his claims for preference on the intensity of his ill-will towards the rival community, however disguised this may have been under some such formula as "the defence of his community's interests." Bad as this would have been, the results of an election in which the two communities were not equally matched would have been worse, for the community that failed to get its representative elected would have inevitably borne a yet deeper grudge against its successful rival. Divided as the two communities were, there was no chance for any political principles coming into prominence during the elections. The creation of separate electorates did a great deal to put a stop to this inter-communal warfare, though I am far from oblivious of the fact that when inter-communal jealousies are acute, the men that are more likely to be returned even from communal electorates are just those who are noted for their ill-will towards the rival community.

"UNITED FAITHS OF INDIA"

In the controversy that raged round the representation of Muslims *as a community* I had taken my full share; but no sooner the Muslim claim had been recognised in practice in the elections to the enlarged councils in 1910, I decided to launch a weekly journal of my own from the seat of the Government of India in order to assist my community in taking its proper share in the political life of the country. I was particularly anxious to help it to understand that while endeavouring to satisfy the pressing needs of the present, which would inevitably bring it now and then into conflict with other elements in the body-politic, it should never lose sight of the prospects of the future when ultimately all communal interests had to be adjusted so as to harmonise with the paramount interests of India.

I had long been convinced that here in this country of hundreds of millions of human beings, intensely attached to religions, and yet infinitely split up into communities, sects and

denominations. Providence had created for us the mission of solving a unique problem and working out a new synthesis, which was nothing less than a Federation of Faiths! As early as in 1904, when I had been only two years in India after my return from Oxford, I had given to this ideal a clear, if still somewhat hesitating expression, in an address delivered at Ahmedabad on the "Proposed Mohammedan University." "Unless some new force"—this is what I had said on that occasion—"unless some new force, *other than the misleading unity of opposition*, unites this vast continent of India, it will either remain a geographical misnomer, or what I think it will ultimately do, become a Federation of Religions." I had noted the strength of the centrifugal force of Indian communities; and yet hope and faith and the deep yearning for freedom had even then made me realise the latent centripetal force of Indian unity. The lines of cleavage were too deeply marked to permit a unity other than federal; and yet, as I had observed in the address from which I have already quoted, the cleavage was not territorial or racial in character, but religious. For more than twenty years I have dreamed the dream of a federation, grander, nobler and infinitely more spiritual than the United States of America, and to-day when many a political Cassandra prophesies a return to the bad old days of Hindu-Muslim dissensions, I still dream that old dream of "United *Faiths* of India." It was in order to translate this dream into reality that I had launched my weekly newspaper, and had significantly called it *The Comrade*—"comrade of all and partisan of none."

Friends, is it so entirely out of place if I quote a little from the first words that I had contributed to the first issue of the *Comrade*? In view of the political controversy that had been raging in India, I naturally shrank from relating my dream when making my *debut* before a sceptical, matter-of-fact world. And yet the dream was all the time there for those who did not despise dreams.

"We have no faith," I wrote on the 14th January, 1911, "in the cry that India is united. If India was united where was the need of dragging the venerable President of this year's Congress from a distant home? The bare imagination of a feast will not dull the edge of

hunger. We have less faith still in the sanctimoniousness that transmutes in its subtle alchemy a rapacious monopoly into fervent patriotism.

> Even as poor bride deceiv'd with painted grapes
> Do surfeit by the eye, and pine the maw.

Those of us who cannot distinguish true gold from the glitter of spurious coins, will one day surfeit by the ear and pine the heart. But the person we love best, fear the most, and trust the least is the impatient idealist. Goethe said of Byron that he was a prodigious poet, but that when he reflected he was a child. Well, we think no better and no worse of the man who combines great ideals and a greater impatience. So many efforts, well-meaning as well as ill-begotten, have failed in bringing unity to this distracted land, that we cannot spare even cheap and scentless flowers of sentiment for the grave of another ill-judged endeavour. We shall not make the mistake of gumming together pieces of broken glass, and then cry over the unsuccessful result, or blame the refractory material. In other words, we shall endeavour to face the situation boldly, and respect facts, facts, howsoever ugly and ill-favoured. It is poor statesmanship to slur over inconvenient realities, and not the least important success in achieving unity is the honest and frank recognition of deep-seated prejudices that hinder it and the yawning differences that divide.

"But while providing for to-day, we must not forget the morrow. It is our firm belief that if the Muslims or the Hindus attempt to achieve success in opposition to or even without the co-operation of one another, they will not only fail, but fail ignominiously. But every step has to be taken with caution. Nothing in history, ancient or modern, provides a useful analogy to the condition of modern India. History never repeats itself. But it is still the best educative force for mankind, and it has its lessons for us also. The problems of India are almost international. But when the statesmen and philanthropists of Europe, with all its wars of interests and national jealousies, do not despair of abolishing war and placing Pax on the throne of Bellona, shall we despair of Indian nationality? We may not create to-day the patriotic fervour and fine national frenzy of Japan with its forty millions of homogeneous people. But a concordat like that of Canada is not beyond the bounds of practicability. It may not be a love-marriage, born of romance and poetry. But a *mariage de convenance*, honourably contracted and honourably maintained, is not to be despised. Let us begin with honest prose, and the Muses will not forbid the banns. Even this is no easy task. But it is one worthy of the sons and daughters of India, and deserves their toil and self-sacrifice. O Unity!"

Thou wilt come, join men, knit nation unto nation;
But not for us who watch to-day and burn.
Thou wilt come; but after what long years of trial,
Weary watching, patient longing, dull denial!

Friends, three years ago we were privileged to catch more than a fleeting glimpse of the unity of which I had dreamed, and if to-day we have to admit, as we must, that the dream has not been realised as fully as we wish, we shall have once more to examine the situation carefully and to face inconvenient facts with candour and with courage. I propose to do that presently, but not to break the thread of my narrative I revert to the situation as it existed at the time when I made my journalistic *debut*.

MUSLIMS AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

As I had foreseen the separate electorates returned both Hindus and Muslims who were not averse to combine in the various legislatures to support the popular cause. Nevertheless, inter-communal hostility did not altogether cease in the country. A new element was, however, unexpectedly added to the situation by aggression of Western nations against Muslim States and its effect on Muslim sentiment in India, and although there are not wanting even to-day staunch non-Muslim nationalists who look askance at Indian Muslim feeling with regard to Muslim affairs abroad, a little reflection would show that the new element to which I have referred, even while undoubtedly diverting the attention of Indian Muslim disillusionment with regard to their traditional reliance on their foreign Government and thereby contributed greatly to Indian unity.

THE OUTLOOK IN 1911

I had intended the *Comrade* to be the organ that was to voice the sentiments I entertained regarding the need of an inter-communal federation for India. It was to prepare the Muslims to make their proper contribution to territorial patriotism without abating one jot of the fervour of their extra-

territorial sympathies, which are, as you must know, part of the quintessence of Islam. When I first thought of launching on a career of journalism I did not expect that any but a small fraction of my attention and energies would be attracted by Muslim politics outside the confines of my own country. It is true that affairs in Egypt did not present a very reassuring appearance; nor did the new constitutions in Turkey and Persia receive, after an initial outburst of welcome, their full measure of sympathy which we in India felt to be due to such heroic and hazardous enterprises from England, the one European Power with which we had all along been exclusively concerned. The only other European Power on our political horizon had been Russia. So long as after the overthrow of France a hundred years previously she was the most considerable of the Powers on the continent of Europe, and had further aggravated that situation by aiming at being a yet greater Power on the continent of Asia, everyone in India had been sedulously taught by the masters of India's destinies to regard her as the enemy of mankind, and to believe that it was the sacred mission of England to thwart and defeat her. But the rapid rise of Japan and its signal success in defeating Russia in the Far East, while it encouraged other Oriental nations to hold up their heads and to hope, so radically altered the position of Russia that, from being an inveterate enemy, she became a friend and in all but name an ally of that nation. This speedily reacted on Eastern politics, not only in Persia, where Russia openly stood up as a high-handed dictator, and where it was soon to cause a hailstorm of ultimatums, but also in Turkey, where the rivalries of the Slav and the Teuton now reappeared with added vehemence in the form of a struggle between Entente and Alliance. Once more had the Near East become the storm-centre of European politics.

All this was no doubt disquieting enough to Indian Muslims who had been brought up from their childhood to regard England as the friend and Russia as the enemy of Muslim States. But the political controversies of Hindus and Muslims appeared none the less to be their immediate concern in India. The

passions that these inter-communal differences had unfortunately aroused just a little previously had lent to them the semblance of acute international conflict, while Turkey and Persia still seemed comparatively remote.

But things did not proceed precisely in the way in which I had so optimistically forecast. The year 1911 proved a fateful year for Muslim States. The Governments of Turkey, Persia and Morocco all began to meet with squalls in their initial voyage of reform and progress, which soon developed into regular storms.

THE DURBAR ANNOUNCEMENT

In India, too, the year proved fateful for Muslims than anyone could have predicted. Just before the close of the year the King Emperor made a portentous Announcement at Delhi where he had come ostensibly to announce in person in an Imperial Durbar only the event of his coronation that year. It was admittedly an abrupt departure from the tradition of British Government and a complete dislocation of official habits. But this unusual procedure, and secrecy which had been maintained. not only at the expense of India but also at that of the Local Governments were justified on the ground that the Imperial Announcement was "one of the most weighty decisions ever taken since the establishment of the British rule in India," and that the discussion of measures which were taken in consequence of an agitation that indicated "bitterness of feeling," and was at the same time "very widespread and unyielding," would have in its turn caused endless agitation. As we all know, the Announcement comprised a readjustment of territories upsetting Lord Curzon's vindictive Partition of Bengal and the creation of the new Province of Bihar and Orissa after the reunion of Bengal, East and West. It also indirectly penalised Bengal by shifting the capital to Delhi. As I wrote in the *Comrade* at the time, I was in favour of both these schemes, "taking each by itself as wholly unconnected scheme", and irrespective of the time, place and procedure preferred by the

Government of India for the Announcement. The Partition in the form then approved was due in 1905, and the transfer of the capital was needed in 1858. Lords Curzon and Middleton had sinned in a hurry, and it would have seemed that Lords Hardinge and Crewe were repenting at leisure. But it was clear from the King Emperor's Announcement as well as from the despatches of the Government of India and the Secretary of State, that "the key-stone of the whole project" was the "proposal to make Delhi the future capital of India"; that it was only "as a consequence of the transfer" that the Partition was modified; that the Bengalis were expected to be "reconciled to the change" of capital by "*other features of the scheme which were specially designed to give satisfaction to Bengali sentiment;*" and that the reunion of the two Bengals was no more than "the compensation which will be offered to Bengali sentiment" for "the objections to the transfer which are likely to be entertained in some quarters." There was not a word in the Government of India's Despatch about such things as the financial embarrassment of the administration in Eastern Bengal, the unsatisfactory results of yoking Assam with a part of Bengal, or the difficulties of communication between the Rajshahi Division and Dacca, all of which could have been utilized to justify the unsettlement of a "settled fact." The Partition of 1905 was indeed acknowledged in that Despatch to have fulfilled two of the chief purposes which its authors had in view." "It relieved," so ran the Despatch, "the overburdened administration of Bengal, and it gave the Mohammedan population of Eastern Bengal advantages and opportunities of which they had, perhaps hitherto not had their fair share." But Bengal had to be deprived of the distinction of claiming the capital of India as its own capital as well, and of the opportunities it had thus enjoyed of criticising the Government of India and subjecting it to constant pressure from such close quarters. We had already been familiarised, to the extent of feeling downright moral contempt for it, with the doctrine of Compensation in the foreign politics of Europe, according to which Morocco had been given to France for the sake of a free hand for the English in Egypt, and Tripoli had been all but given to Italy, while Germany had

made her famous *Panther* leap at Agadir. This fatal doctrine had now peacefully penetrated into the internal administration of India. "Eastern Bengal and Assam," wrote the Government of India, "have no doubt benefited greatly by the Partition, and the Mohammedans of the province, who form a large majority of the population, are loyal and contented; but the resentment among the Bengalis in both the provinces of Bengal, who hold most of the land, fill the professions and exercise a preponderating influence in public affairs, is as strong as ever." As I wrote on that occasion, "what could be easier than to politely disburden the loyal and contented Peter of his few worldly belongings in order to load the discontented, if not disloyal, Paul with rewards and compensation? The Muslims have no *Panther* to send to Agadir, and it is too well-established a rule of diplomacy that no *Panther*, no compensation!"

ITS REACTION ON MUSLIM POLITICS

While I declared in the *Comrade* that "in our judgment the Muslims should accept the decision of the Government." I could not but say that they had deserved a better fate. Before the Partition they had laboured under many difficulties and had endured everything quietly as only the weak can endure. It was not they that had clamoured and agitated for the Partition. Nevertheless, the Partition came to them as a well-deserved though wholly unexpected blessing. Their condition had begun to improve, and with that their ambitions and hopes. It may even be confessed that, like all *noveaux riches*, these political *parvenus* sometimes held their heads too high and strutted about in the peacock manner. But, like the exaltation born of a draught of hashish, it did not last long, and the reaction came with a suddenness and a force that were terrible. The emancipated slaves were, so to speak, once more sold into bondage, and who does not know that revenge is sweet? Their old masters could have been excused if on being placed once more in the position of the slave-driver they had used the lash and the bastinado a little too lavishly. The Muslims of Eastern

Bengal had been made to fight the battle of their rulers, against their neighbours, and now that it was no longer convenient for the rulers to continue the fight, they had made their own peace with all convenient speed, and had left the Muslims to the mercy of those against whom they had been used as auxiliaries. It would be hard to discover in history a more ignoble instance of betrayal in which "loyalty" has been rewarded with deprivation of recently recovered rights, and "contentment" has been punished as the worst of crimes. Perhaps I may mention without any indiscretion that, when immediately after the announcement I drove over in haste to interview Sir Charles Bayley, the head of the Local Government now thrown on the scrap-heap, I met Lord Sinha and Sir Benode Mitter, who asked me what I thought of the announcement. I told them that in the case of the Hindus of Bengal the announcement had been a matter of "give-and-take," that for "sturdy loyal" Beharis it had been one of "take" only, but that for the Muslims of Eastern Bengal it had been one of nothing but "give," and as a reward for their loyalty and contentment they had been given a generous helping of humble pie. And then I walked off with the mumbled prayer that they might be spared too acute an attack of indigestion! In the Durbar itself a little earlier I remember that I had been accosted by my old friend Sir Charles Cleveland, Director of the Criminal Intelligence Department, as I was hastily perusing the announcement. As it happened, I was among the very first in the Press Camp to receive a copy of it from the hands of the official who was distributing them. Sir Charles had humorously asked me if there was anything in the announcement for me or for him, and I had replied with ill-suppressed bitterness that there was nothing for me, but that there was plenty of work for him. And who can say that my prophecy has not proved true?

Friends, I have gone into this matter at considerable length only because the announcement has always appeared to me to be a very distinct landmark in the political progress of the Muslims. Nothing could have more clearly convinced them

that their dependence upon a foreign government for support against sister-communities laid them perpetually open to such betrayals. They now realised that they could place no reliance on such support, whether at home or abroad, and it set them thinking that perhaps at a much smaller sacrifice of their interests they could purchase lasting peace and even secure the friendship of their neighbours and fellow-countrymen.

SELF-GOVERNMENT AS THE MUSLIM LEAGUE'S CREED

The Muslim League, although never an anti-Hindu or anti-Congress organisation, had at its birth in the very midst of the Partition agitation, naturally emphasised in its creed the protection of communal interests and loyalty to Government, even though it had also included therein the promotion of harmony and concord with sister-communities. A year after the Durbar announcement, the Council of the League recommended a change in the creed, and it emphasised in the new creed that it recommended "Self-government suitable for India" as its ideal. In commenting upon this change, which was eventually accepted by the League in its annual session in the following March, I had stated that for the Muslims their new political creed was but "the half-way house from which their ultimate destination was clearly visible," and I do not think I can do better in helping you to form a just estimate of our position to-day than quote from the *Comrade* of that date the following passage which I would ask all Nationalists, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, to consider carefully:

But it is not so much on the reform of the administration by the administrators and those to whom they are responsible, nor even on the relationship that comes to exist between the ruler and the ruled that the attainment of self-government depends. Self-government is the necessary corollary of self-realisation, and India as a whole has not yet realised herself. Once her conflicting interests, warring creeds and rival communities not only conceive that India can be one in her soul as she is in her body, but feel her unity as an individual feels the unity of his individual self in spite of the diversity of the various members and organs of his body, and the varying moods of his intel-

lect and soul, there is no power in the world that can deny her self-government. But we would warn our countrymen against playing the sedulous ape in their methods of nation-making as we have warned them in the matter of their choosing their political goal... In India political unity can be achieved not so much by annihilating smaller units that may appear to conflict with the ultimate scheme of unity, but by recognising their force and inevitableness. If we could choose a motto for a society of nation-makers in India, we could suggest nothing better than what the United States of America have adopted. India is to be a *pluribus unum*.

MUSLIMS AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In foreign affairs the year 1912 had opened with far different prospects from those of 1911. Up to the last, Indian Muslims had entertained the hope that things would right themselves. But this did not happen, and the year ended even worse than it had begun. The sad disillusionment with regard to international morality for which the shameless brigandage of Italy in Tripoli was responsible had greatly affected the Muslims in the autumn of 1911. If any further disillusionment was needed, it was supplied by the action of Russia in Persia and Britain's "sanctimonious acquiescene." In both cases the utmost brutality characterised European aggression. Who can forget the massacres in the Tripoli Oasis or the celebration in Persia of the New Year, which coincided with the anniversary of the Tragedy of Kerbala, when, among others, the Siqat-ul-Islam, the highest ecclesiastic of Northern Persia—a man universally respected alike for his learning, his piety and his tolerance—was hanged by the Russians. If anything could surpass these things in the anguish they caused to Muslim minds, it was the threatened aeroplane attack on the Holy Ka'ba by Italy and the actual bombardment of Holy Meshed by Russia which followed them. Truly did Mr. Shuster declare at a banquest given in his honour by the Persia Committee in London on his visit there after his expulsion from Persia: "I am not bitter about my own experience, but I should be a hypocrite if I pretended not to sympathise with the bitterness of the Mohammadan people who have so forcibly learned the lesson that the Ten Commandments do not

apply to international politics. Let anyone who doubts this review the events of the past year." These better experiences were destined to be followed by those still more bitter in 1912 in the autumn of which broke out the Balkan War, which at one time threatened to expel the Turks from Europe after nearly five hundred years.

REACTION ON MUSLIM FEELING IN INDIA

The attitude of England towards the enemies of Turkey, Persia and Morocco had begun to alienate the sympathies of Indian Muslims from England ever since 1911 : and this estrangement could not but react on their relations with the British officials here, who, in spite of their detestation of the Radical politicians in power in England, could not help looking askance at Indians daring to criticise an England Government with a candour and a courage unusual in a subject race. The *Comrade* case, which for the first time brought home to Indians the power of the now defunct Press Act for evil, was concerned, as many of you may still remember, with the forfeiture of a pamphlet received from the Turks. In this they had only appealed to England for Christian succour against the Bulkan Allies whose Macedonian atrocities were therein depicted. While this litigation was going on, the fatal developments following on the demolition of part of a small mosque at Cawnpore embittered Muslim feeling still further. In consequence of all this I had proceeded to England, in company with the then Secretary of the Muslim League, to appeal to the British Government and persuade it to alter a policy, Indian as well as foreign, that seemed to bode no good to anybody, and which was sure to drive the Muslims to despair. In this we partly succeeded ; but within a year events of far greater magnitude occurred in which the entire world was involved. The War and the events leading to the participation of Turkey not on the same side as England undid all the good that we had expected to follow the friendly deputation of Indian Muslims which we had taken to wait on Lord Hardinge earlier in the year, and which had beed received by the Viceroy with every show of good-will.

OUTBREAK OF WAR AND MUSLIM FEELING IN INDIA

When the war with Germany broke out, I think I fairly represented the feeling of educated and responsible Indian Muslims who were too self-respecting to play the sycophant when I wrote in the *Comrade* of the 12th August 1914, as follows:—

> There are still some sane people among Indians themselves, and though they do not advertise the offer of their personal services to the Government, whatever influence they possess with the people would be used to decrease rather than increase the Government's embarrassment. They could offer no better guarantee than this that they regard India's connection with Great Britain as, at the present stage of India's growth, indispensable; and we are sure that the less lofty motive of self-interest would wear better and stand the strain of circumstances longer than the lip-loyaly of 'Ji-Hazurs.'
>
> Whether Great Britain has respected Muslim Indian feeling in her dealings with Turkey, Persia, Morocco, or not; whether the utterances of His Majesty's Ministers regarding the Turks in their life and death struggle during the last war have been just and consistent, or unjust and inconsistent; whether their action following two breaches of treaty obligations, by Austria in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and by Italy in the Tripolitaine, have tallied or not with the recent public proclamation of their sense of the sacredness of treaties; whether their conscience has revolted or not at the slaughter of babes and sucklings, unprotected womanhood and bed-ridden age in Tripoli and the Balkans; whether the white Colonials' treatment of their coloured fellow-citizens of the same Empire has been fair or otherwise: whether the Home Government has exerted its full pressure on the Colonials to right the wrong, or has only assumed an incredible importance; whether Indians' claims for an equitable adjustment of rights and duties and for a fair share in guiding the destinies of their own country have been met by the British Bureaucracy in the spirit of friendliness, or of jealousy and rancour; whether in the annulment of the Partition of Bengal the Muslims were treated with due consideration for their loyalty, or it was underrated and their contentment taken too much for granted; whether the sanctity of their places of worship and the integrity of their graveyards have been uniformly respected, or sometimes lightly sacrificed to the Moloch of Prestige—we say that, irrespective of any or all these considerations, or rather because we have carefully weighed them all against the one supreme consideration our need of England and her tutelage at the present stage of our national and communal growth, and found her good exceeding by a great deal her evil, we shall remain loyal to her as

only freemen can remain loyal, with a sincere devotion and an unbought submission, and this whether she crushes the naval power of Germany and becomes a dictator to Europe, or the last ship of her mighty Armada sinks in the North Sea and her last soldier falls down and dies round Liege or London ... Even if England may not need us, we have need of her. Believing in political purity rather than in political prudery, we have entered the lists with her biggest bureaucrats in India in time of peace. But in time of war the clash of steel in civic battles must cease and the voice of controversy must be hushed, and if we cannot hastily command in others an enthusiasm for this war which we ourselves do not feel, let us once and for all assure the Government that, so far as we and those within the orbit of our influence are concerned, they can sleep in peace. Let alone Provincial straps and the still greater despots of their districts, their meanest, if not their humblest, policeman will find us at his beck and call whenever civic excitement has to be allayed. More than this we cannot proclaim. Less than this we shall not confess. This is and has always been our creed and to that we shall adhere.

Friends, I fear, I must have exhausted your patience with these long quotations from the *Comrade*, but I feel certain of your indulgence if you would only consider the object I have in view. This long narration is intended to show to the world how different were the feelings of Indian Muslims towards this Government until quite recent times, and what patience we had shown in the face of injustice, in difference and continued callousness.

TURKEY AND INDIAN MUSLIM FEELING

At the suggestion of Government, and through its own medium, I had even cabled, along with my friend Dr. Ansari, to the late lamented Talaat Pasha urging the Turks to think a thousand times before they participated in the War. And even when war was being forced on Turkey by ill-advised threats such as those of the *London Times*, my very long, well-known and in the English Press extensively quoted and highly approved article, in reply to that of *The Times*, on the "Choice of the Turks," had shown to what lengths Indian Muslims were then prepared to go in assisting their foreign Government.

I shall only quote to you the final conclusion at which after very careful and detailed reasoning I had myself arrived in that article, and which I had recommended to the Muslims for adoption as the policy of the community.

> All truly loyal people (I wrote) have closed the chapter of civic controversy with the officials and into that book they are likely to look no more. Whatever our grievances, whatever reforms we desire, everything must wait for a more seasonable occasion. Even if the Government were to concede to us all that we ever desired or dream; if, for instance, the Muslim University were offered to us on our own terms, or the Press Act repeal were to be announced; or even if Self-Government were to be conceded to us, we would humbly tell Government this is no time for it, and we must for the present decline such concessions with thanks. Concessions are asked for and accepted in peace. We are not Russian Poles. We need no bribes!

A conclusion such as this had recommended itself even to the Calcutta correspondent of the *Morning Past*. And yet it was for publishing this very article that I forfeited the security of the *Comrade* Press and had in consequence to discontinue that paper. It was then that a distinguished weekly journal of England. *The New Statesman*, severely criticised the Government of India in a leading article sarcastically headed "Encouraging Loyalty in India"! And when the war with Turkey actually broke out, a representative of the Associated Press and Reuters interviewed me at Delhi and subsequently informed me that the interview was much appreciated by the Viceroy who had seen it before publication. I had predicted in the previous article that even if war broke out with the Turks the anchor of the Indian Muslims' loyalty would hold, and now that war had broken out I repeated that the anchor still held. I asked them to commend their souls to God and to place their services at the disposal of the Government for the preservation of peace and tranquillity in India. I compared their position to that of the children of parents who had quarrelled with one another. "Right may be on one side or the other, but the sorrow and suffering are in any case those of the children."

THE LIMITS OF MUSLIM "LOYALTY"

In their interview, as also in the last leading article, the *Comrade* was permitted to publish before it closed its doors, it was clearly indicated that Muslims were placing implicit reliance on the solemn pledges given by the British Government and Britain's Allies with regard to their faith and the Holy Places of Islam. I had distinctly pointed out that *Arabia must not be attacked nor must the protection of Islam's Holy Places by a really independent Muslim Power be endangered.* This was the least to which Indian Muslims were entitled unless their religion was required by their non-Muslim Government to be a matter of no consequence to them as compared with their "loyalty" to that Government. I may add that I had concluded my interview with the statement that the Muslims could be trusted to act on the precept of Jesus Christ, to render unto Cæser what is due to Cæsar. But I was informed by the distinguished journalist who had recorded the interview that the Censor of Press telegrams, who was no doubt a good Christian, while passing the rest of the message, had carefully scored out the exhortation of Jesus Christ. No doubt that astute official, who believed in the supremacy of the State over the Church, thought that if the Muslims were reminded of their duty to render unto Cæsar what was due to Cæsar, they might perchance remember the accompanying exhortation also to render unto God what was due to God!

DEFIANCE OF MUSLIM RELIGION AND DISREGARD OF MUSLIM RIGHTS

This was precisely what happened before very long, and the history of our betrayals is too recent to be repeated in any detail. During the War Muslims were required, in defiance of their religious obligations, to assist Government in waging war against the Khalifa and those engaged in *Jihad*. The Jazirat-ul-Arab, which includes Syria, Palstine and Mesopotamia, and which Muslims were required by their faith at all times to keep free from non-Muslim occupation and control,

was attacked and occupied by Great Britain and her Allies, and is still under their control in defiance of their Prophet's well known testamentary injunction. The Holy Places of Islam, *which are not particular buildings merely, but territories*, including the three Sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, have been filched from the Successor of the Prophet and Commander of the Faithful, who is their only accredited Servant and Warden, and even to-day he is not permitted to occupy, defend and serve them. The dismemberment of the Empire of the Khalifa; the appointment of non-Muslim Mandatories to control various portions of it; and the consequent weakening of the temporal power of Islam to the point of danger to its spiritual influence, through the possible pressure of the temporal power of rival creeds, were openly advocated by the Allies, and none of them insisted upon this course so relentlessly up to the last as Great Britain herself. As we all know, Greece was her own brutal nominee and agent in the execution of this policy even after the armistice in defiance of all laws of peace or war, and however much the other Allies also may have resisted Ismet Pasha at Lausanne, it was Great Britain herself that was the chief obstacle in the path of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha to the very end of this tragic tale. Discrimination was made against Muslims governments and populations in various other ways also, such as by the denial of self-determination to the Muslim populations of territories forcibly annexed or occupied and controlled by non-Muslim Powers. While all this was going on, Indian Muslim opinion, unrepresented at the Peace Conference, and represented before the Allies themselves only by unrepresentative Muslims, was vigorously suppressed in India by means of those well-known engines of tyranny and terrorism, the Press Act, the Defence of India Act, Regulation III of 1818 and, finally, the declaration of Martial Law in parts of India, over and above the abuse of the ordinary penal law of the land.

THE TIME WAS RIPE FOR REUNION

I have alrerdy declared it as my view that the bitter ex-

perience of ill-will against the Muslim States and populations abroad hastened to conversion of the Muslims to the view that to rely on this foreign and non-Muslim Government for support and sympathy, even after making every conceivable sacrifice for its sake, was futile, and that if they were in need of support and sympathy they must have a lasting, equitable settlement with the sister-communities of India. The same course was clearly indicated by the betrayal of the Muslims of Eastern Bengal. And the time too was ripe for a Hindu-Muslim reunion. True partnership and association, whether in business, social relationship or in love, requires that there should be no great disparity between those that are to associate together as partners, friends or lovers. The same is true of politics. Union of the rich and poor, of the old and the young, of the learned and the ignorant is perhaps possible but far from common; and it was a true instinct that guided Syed Ahmad Khan in opposing, a generation previously, the yoking together of the strong and the weak. During the controversy with regard to the Minto-Morley Reforms, however, Muslims had developed to some extent the quality of self-assertion so necessary in politics. But ever since the outbreak of the Tripolitan war they had had to struggle against the repressive policy of the Government, and it is not with a view to praise my own community that I say it has now to a considerable extent made up the distance between itself and the more advanced communities of India by dint of forced marches which it had to undertake throughout this momentous period.

THE RAPPROCHEMENT

It was at my brother's suggestion and my own during our internment that in 1915 the Muslim League held its annual session at Bombay where the Congress was also to meet. Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque, the veteran Congressman, who was nevertheless one of the founders of the Muslim League and who had valiantly stuck to the Congress all these years in spite of the fact that the bulk of his community was still following the lead

of Syed Ahmad Khan given thirty years ago, was now elected President of the Muslim League with great *eclat*. He was called upon to execute the mandate of his own community and bring about a joint meeting of the political leaders in the camps of the League and the Congress in order to adjust the future political relations of the various communities concerned. Mr. Jinnah's persuasive advocacy was added to the vigour of the President, and, last but not least, the audacious courage and vehement perseverance of that intrepid Muslim patriot, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, brought the *rapprochement* which was to bear fruit in the following year in the historic Lucknow Compact. So rapid had been the progress of the Muslims that a mildewed critic from among their own community observed that Lord Sinha, the Bengali President of the Bombay Session of the Indian National Congress, had travelled thither by the same train as his Behari neighbour and brother-lawyer who presided over the Muslim League, and the two had borrowed one another's Presidential Addresses in order to compare notes. But, said the critic with more wit than wisdom, the two Presidents forget to take back their own productions, and by an irony of fate Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque had read to his Muslim audience as his own the pungent oration characteristic of the Bengali, and Lord Sinha had done likewise and read to the Congress delegates the cautious and halting address of the "ever-loyal" Muslim.

Government had not come to realise what would be the inevitable result of the Bombay *rapprochement*, and it is a matter of history how the Muslim Leaguers were compelled to conclude *in camera* the session begun under such auspices. Thenceforward, the Congress and the Muslim League always met for their annual sessions at the same centre and worked in entire co-operation. The result was inevitable and could well have been foreseen. If the Congress President of the Ahmedabad Session was lodged in the Alipore gaol when he should have been occupying the Presidential chair at Ahmedabad, the President of the Muslim League for the same year was indicted for waging war against the King at Ahmedabad itself on account of his Presidential address, and, even when acquitted by the unanimous verdict of

the jury on that charge, was consigned to the Ahmedabad gaol after being convicted of sedition. It is a feather in the Muslim cap that while Srijut Das has brilliantly led the Swarajists to victory in Bengal and elsewhere, his Muslim *confrere* Maulana Hasrat Mohani is now sharing the honours of Yervada gaol with Mahatma Gandhi, having in the meantime more than doubled his original sentence, in spite of the restricted opportunities for indulging in criminal practices that a prisoner's life affords, and has thus corrected the error of a blundering jury!

MUSLIM REALIZATION OF LARGER INDIAN INTERESTS

But it was not only a case of safeguarding Muslim communal interest without leaning for support eternally on a foreign Government and harbouring suspicions against sister communities. Muslims would have been more than human, or less than that if they had been indifferent to the continued injustice done to India and Indians collectively. Having been taught by their political preceptors in the past that Government could never for long leave a wrong unredressed, they had followed the policy of "wait and see." They had waited long, and yet all that they saw was a series of wrongs done to India —wrongs which remained unrepented and unredressed. Their patience was at last giving way and they were beginning to enlist as Congress members in annually increasing numbers. This was a hopeful indication of their realizing that they had to protect not only their comparatively petty communal interests but also the larger Indian national interests, which were surely theirs to protect as those of sister communities. They now realized more than ever that by being Muslims they could not cease to be Indians. The Congress sessions of Calcutta, Bombay and Delhi had progressively justified the national appellation of the Congress. But it was reserved for General Dyer to break down entirely the barrier that Sir Syed Ahmad Khan had for temporary purposes erected more than thirty years previously, and to summon the Muslims of India to the Congress held at Amritsar in

1919 as the unsuspecting Herald of India's Nationhood. The bullets of his soldiery made no distinction between Hindu and Muslim, and clearly Providence had so designed things that a community even more loyal than the Muslims, namely our brave Sikh brothers should also dye the sacred soil of their religious capital at Amritsar with their own blood along with that of Hindu and Muslim martyrs.

THE COMING OF THE MAHATMA

Much of the suffering undergone at Jallianwala Bagh was, however, of a passive character, nor invited nor cheerfully borne, and the terror that the proceedings of the administrators of Martial Law had created seemed at one time to have paralysed the people of the Punjab soon after they had discovered their national identity through common suffering. But the Punjab was not left to sorrow alone. More than one patriotic Indian proceeded to the Punjab ; but I feel confident they themselves would be the first to admit that I do them no injustice when I declare that the most historic event that took place during those eventful days was the "Coming of the Mahatma !"

The Mahatma's story is too well-known to you all, and now happily to a good many well-informed people outside India also; for me to recapitulate it here. His experiences in South Africa had taught him that it was idle to expect justice for Indians overseas unless justice was done to Indians at home and India secured a government of her own. This, of course, did not mean that the British connection must necessarily be broken ; and even to-day not only he, whose forbearance is proverbial, but also followers of his, like myself, who cannot pretend to be equally forbearing, believe in spite of the bitter experiences of the last few years, that the truest Swaraj for India is not incompatible with the British connection if the British nation and the British Government only undergo a change of heart and make a *pryaschit* for the past. It was no doubt to deliver India from her bonds, spiritual no less than political, that the Mahatma had returned to the Motherland.

But the methods that he himself believed in and inculcated to his fellow-countrymen were not those that would be called "political" in the politics-ridden West. To him, as to all great teachers of mankind, Life was a single synthesis, however much we might analyse it for the convenience of philosophical study, and there was no direct antithesis between the political and the spiritual.

JESUS AND ISRAEL : PARALLEL SITUATION

Many have compared the Mahatma's teachings, and latterly his personal sufferings, to those of Jesus (on whom be peace); but the analogy goes farther than many have yet realised. Jesus was a Jew, and those who lovingly followed him acclaimed him as the Messiah of the House of David who had come to restore to the Israelites their lost independence and power. Just as the "Tragedy of History" had been illustrated by the doom required by long-gathering guile on the case of the Ten Tribes of the kingdom of Samaria, who were crushed and practically annihilated or dispersed by Assyria more than seven hundred years before the birth of Jesus, so was it illustrated again a century and a quarter later in the case of their no less guilty brothers of Judah when Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian, destroyed the Temple of Solomon, razed Jerusalem to the ground, and, making the Jews his captives, carried them into exile.

Ever since then the Israelites had dreamt dreams of revenge and restoration, and the victory of Cyrus seemed at one time to realise all that had been hoped. The rebuilding of the Temple had commenced, and after a temporary suspension resumed. Zerubbabel, who was of the line of David, was the hope of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah the son of Iddo, who looked forward to the political regeneration of the Jews, consequent on the overthrow and destruction of "the kingdoms of the nations." The line of David was hoped to be restored in the person of Zerubbabel himself, and the Messianic predictions of earlier prophets thus fulfilled. This prediction was, however, not fulfilled at the time, and whatever became of Zerubbabel,

who disappears with the coronation scene in Zechariah, he never wore a real crown nor sat upon the throne of his fathers.

Israel was destined never more to taste the sweets of independence; but, whether under the yoke of Greeks or of Romans, Israel never lost the hope of restoration. "The triumphal and often cruel entry of Greek and Roman civilization into Asia threw it back upon its dreams. More than ever it invoked the Messiah as judge and avenger of the people. A complete renovation, a revolution which would shake the world to its very foundations, was necessary in order to satisfy the enormous thirst for vengeance excited in it by the sense of its superiority and by the sight of its humiliation." (Renan)

Herod the Great who had contrived to secure some semblance of independence from Rome had died about the year in which Jesus was born, and "his three sons were only lieutenants of Romans, analogous to the Rajas of India under the English dominion." (Renan) When during the childhood of Jesus, Archelaus, its ethnarch, was deposed by Augustus, the last trace of self-government was lost to Jerusalem. Judea was thenceforward part of a dependency of the province of Syria, which was governed by an imperial legate. A series of Roman procurators, subordinate in important matters to the imperial legate of Syria, of whom Pontius Pilate is so well known to Christian history, were constantly occupied in extinguishing the volcano which was seething beneath their feet. Continual sedition, excited by the zealots of Mosaism did not cease, in fact, to agitate Jerusalem during all this time. To cast down the Roman eagle, and destroy the works of arts raised by the Herods, in which the Mosaic regulations were not always respected, in perpetual temptations to fanatics who had reached that degree of exaltation which removed all care for life. The Samaritans were agitated by movements of a similar nature. The "Zelotes" or "Sicarii", pious assassins who imposed on themselves the task of killing whoever in their estimation broke the law, began to appear. A movement which had much more influence upon Jesus was that of Judas, the Gaulonite, or Galilean. The census which was the basis of taxation by the

foreigner was hated as almost an impiety. That ordered in the sixth year of the Christian era had fully reawakened the theocratic abhorrence of Gentile government and had caused a great fermentation. In fact, an insurrection had broken out in the Northern provinces from which the greatest achievements of the Jewish people had always proceeded. "Men deemed themselves on the eve of the great renovation the Scriptures, tortured into diverse meanings, fostered the most colossal hopes. In each line of the writings of the Old Testament they saw the assurance, and in a manner the programme, of the future reign, which was to bring peace to the righteous, and to seal for ever the work of God." (Renan)

THE MORAL REVOLUTION OF JESUS

When Jesus contemplated the world at the outset of his ministry he was called upon to make his choice of the weapons of reform. The conditions of his people and his times, as I think, rather than any fundamental objection to the use of force in all circumstances, as Christian churchmen profess, made him pin his faith to non-resistance of evil. In other words, he decided to defeat force by his own suffering just as Husain subsequently did at Karbala, although the latter died sword in hand. But whatever view we may take of the choice of Jesus, it is certain that his fundamental idea was different from that of the political reformers of his time such as Judas the Gaulonite, whose example had shown him the futility of the popular seditions of his day. If ever he was the author of the disclaimer : "My kingdom is not of this world," he must have meant that he was not setting out to defeat Satan, "the Prince of this world" with the help of Satanic weapons. He was not "worldly" in his methods ; but this does not mean that he was "other-worldly." All that it signifies is that he was "unworldly." Having resisted the temptation to be a political revolutionary on the very threshold of his career as a Teacher, he never succumbed to it. The revolution he wished to effect was a moral revolution, and although he did not escape the fate of "rebels," and was placed on the

Cross by order of Pilate with the description, "King of the Jews," which is, in spite of its intended irony, significant of the Roman Procurator's political suspicions. Liberty for him meant in the first instance Truth and Self-Purification. Renan was, to my mind, a typical Frenchman of his times for whom the claims of the State were paramount, and he could neither understand nor appreciate the thorough-going theocracy of Jesus, the "Servant of the Lord." Nevertheless, I agree with him in the conclusion that "as an austere republican or a zealous patriot he would not have arrested the great current of the affairs of his age; but in declaring that politics is insignificant, he has revealed that one's country is not everything, and that the man is before, and higher than, the citizen." Vengeance which was consuming the Israelites, was the Lord's. Jesus counselled the upholders of the *lex talionis* who claimed an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth that he who had been smitten on one cheek should turn the other cheek also to the smiter. So much for the foreign tyrant. As for his own countryman, the Jew, who, falling a victim to his own weakness and a fear of the Gentile masters of Judea, had become a publican or tax-collector on behalf of the foreigner, he too could easily claim a share in the abounding love of Jesus. The idea of being all-powerful by suffering and resignation, and of triumphing oven force by purity of heart, is as old as the days of Abel and Cain, the first progeny of Man. But since it so eminently suited the conditions of the times of Jesus, and the record of his ministry, however inadequate or defective, has still preserved for us this part of his teachings in some detail, it has come to be regarded by Christians and even by many non-Christians as an idea peculiar to Jesus.

JESUS AND GANDHI

Be that as it may, it was just as peculiar to Mahatma Gandhi also; but it was reserved for a Christian government to treat as a felon the most Christ-like man of our times and to penalise as a disturber of the public peace the one man engaged in public affairs who comes nearest to the Prince of Peace. The political

conditions of India just before the advent of the Mahatma resembled those of Judea on the eve of the advent of Jesus, and the prescription that he offered to those in search of a remedy for the ills of India was the same that Jesus had dispensed before in Judea. Self-purification through suffering; a moral preparation for the responsibilities of government; self-discipline as the condition precedent of Swaraj—this was the Mahatma's creed and conviction; and those of us who have been privileged to have lived in the glorious year that culminated in the Congress session at Ahmedabad have seen what a remarkable and what a rapid change he wrought in the thoughts, feelings and actions of such large masses of mankind.

THE MAHATMA AND SATYAGRAHA

Mahatma Gandhi had been in direct touch with the Indian Government, had often counselled the Viceroy, and had continued his assistance to the British Government in its hour of need in South Africa by working as the unpaid recruiting sergeant of that Government in India. This had indeed amazed those who could not associate him whose life itself was a Sermon on the Mount with recruitment of blood-spilling soldiers. Yet even so loyal a subject and so staunch a friend was compelled to oppose a measure of that Government which no one reading British declarations of gratitude for India's loyalty in the early stages of the War could have conceived as the possible culmination of that gratitude at the end of that War. A Reform Scheme was under consideration professedly for enlarging the Indians' share in Indian administration. But while one hand was declared to be about to give a wider franchise of India, the other was already busy robbing her even of her narrowly restricted liberties. This is what my brother and I wrote to Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy, from our internment at Chhindwara on the 24th April 1919, when we were about to court imprisonment by breaking the Defence of India Regulations which had curtailed our liberties four years previously:

The War is now over; but the spirit of tyranny that it generated is

still abroad; and while, on the one hand, it is being proclaimed in high-sounding phrases that those who are assembled at Paris to decide the destinies of the world on more equitable and humane basis than Brute Force are not the masters of the People, but their servants, the Government, on the other hand, is denying to the people of India the barest expression on questions that vitally concern them. Not only is the gag not to be removed yet from our own mouths, but a gag of prodigious proportions has been prepared now for silencing more than three hundred millions of God's articulate creatures. The Rowlatt Bill just enacted in the most tyrannical manner has ended the reign of law and substituted a reign of terror in its place, and although it affects every section of the people of India, the Muslims are certain to be its first and its worst victims. It has been the Muslim Press that has suffered most under the Press Act, and the same has been true of the Defence of India Act, if we only exclude the unfortunate young men of Bengal rotting in solitary cells or swampy islands, without trial or hope of release. Even those who profess a pathetic optimism and hope against hope that the bureaucracy armed with the strength of the giant will not use it as tyrannically as the giant, need only have access to our own experience to be cured of this distressing delusion. We, who have already had enough experience of "executive discretion" and of "investigating authorities" sitting *in camera*, farcically enquiring into undefined charges, and dealing with undisclosed "evidence" without the help of any code of procedure or law of evidence, submitting reports that cannot bear the light of day, and being finally dismissed as ignorant persons for all their pains, can claim to speak with some authority, and say that the Black Act is nothing more or less than the virtual outlawry of a fifth of mankind.

It was our privilege to point out to Mahatma Gandhi the real import and full scope of the Rowlatt Bills, soon after he commenced his famous Satyagraha campaign. This was the first dawn of the era of Non-Co-operation. The occurrences at Delhi, Amritsar and Lahore, and in Ahmedabad and other parts of Gujarat are matters of history, and although the Mahatma's admission of his "Himalayan error" has been proclaimed to the world by the Government, and the official and unofficial scribes who have been enlisted in its support, none seems to have had the honesty to admit that the Mahatma's blunder would have overtopped Everest if he had not then united his nation as he did in defence of its liberties. At the very worst the "Himalayan error" consisted in miscalculating the extent of the people's discipline and self-restraint. But if Mahatma Gandhi had left

the Rowlatt Bills unchallenged, he would have been guilty of a sin of which he could hardly have purged himself by any kind of expiation. Place all the violence of the infuriated mobs on one side, and on the other side place the cowardliness of a surrender to the slavery sought to be imposed on the nation by these Bills, and, in spite of my utter abhorrence of such violence, I say with all deliberateness that on the Day of Judgment I would rather stand before God's White Throne guilty of all this violence than have to answer for the unspeakable sin of so cowardly a surrender. In saying this I am only applying to the situation four years earlier my chief's own admission in the court of the judge who had ordered that for six years he should be "buried alive." "I knew," admitted the Mahatma, "that I was playing with fire." But he also added: "I ran the risk, and if I was set free I would still do the same!" Christ-like in his methods he has been Christ-like to the end. He had "steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem," and not even the prospect of the Cross could make him shrink from treading the path of duty.

NON-VIOLENCE

I would like to restate here the position of men like myself with regard to non-violence. I am not a Christian believing in the sinfulness of all resistance to evil, and in their practice, even if not in their theory, the vast bulk of Christians and all Christian States are in full agreement with me. The last War presented an excellent opportunity to these States and to Christians at large to demonstrate their belief in the doctrine of non-resistance, but we know that none of the States followed it, and the few Christians whose practice was not divorced from their professions were the "conscientious objectors" contemptuously called "conchies," who were subjected to ridicule and contumely and were punished like felons. But that was not all. Every national Chruch blessed the national Flag and sent the national warriors as on a Crusade. As a Muslim and a follower of the Last of the Prophets (on whom be Allah's blessings and peace!), I believe that war is a great evil; but I also believe that there are worse

things than war. "There is no compulsion in faith," says the Quran, because force and religious conviction have no common denominator. They belong to two very different planes. But when war is forced on a Muslim, and the party that does so has no other argument but this, then, as a Muslim and the follower of the Last of the Prophets, I may not shrink, but must give the enemy battle on his own ground and beat him with his own weapons. If he respects no other argument than force and would use it against me, I would defend my Faith against his onslaught and would use against him all the force I could command,—force without stint and without cessation. But when, in the language of the Quran, War hath dropped her weapons", my sword must also be sheathed. Warfare, according to the Quran, is an evil; but persecution is a worse evil, and may be put down with the weapons of war. When persecution ceases, and every man is free to act with the sole motive of securing divine goodwill, warfare must cease. These are the limits of Violence in Islam, as I understand it, and I cannot go beyond these limits without infringing the Law of God. But I have agreed to work with Mahatma Gandhi, and our compact is that as long as I am associated with him I shall not resort to the use of force even for purposes of self-defence. And I have willingly entered into this compact because I think we can achieve victory without violence; that the use of violence for a nation of three hundred and twenty millions of people should be a matter of reproach to it; and, finally, that victory achieved with violence must be not the victory of all sections of the nation, but mainly of the fighting classes, which are more sharply divided in India from the rest of the nation than perhaps anywhere else in the world. Our Swaraj must be the Raj of all, and, in order to be that, it must have been won through the willing sacrifice of all. If this is not so, we shall have to depend for its maintenance as well on the prowess of the fighting classes, and this we must not do. Swaraj must be won by the minimum sacrifice of the maximum number, and not by the maximum sacrifice of the minimum number. Since I have full faith in the possibilities of the programme of constructive work of Non-Violent Non-Co-operation, I have no need to hanker after violence.

Even if this programme *fails* to give us victory, I know that suffering willingly and cheerfully undergone will prove to have been the best preparation even for the effective use of Force. But, God willing, the constructive programme will not fail us if we work with a will and accustom the nation to undergo the small sacrifices that it entails.

VIOLENCE OF NON-CO-OPERATORS AND THEIR OPPONENTS CONTRASTED

These being my innermost convictions, I cannot help marvelling at the audacity of those that attribute to us a desire to involve the country in violence, carnage and anarchy. They presume to demand from us who stand between them and violence an assurance of non-violence. And yet their own hands are red with the blood of the innocents shed in Jallianwalla Bagh—blood still as unrepented as it is unavenged. Contrast this patent insincerity with the frank acceptance by our chief of his full responsibility for Chauri-Chaura and the Bombay riots and you have the measure of the moral worth of Non-Co-operation and of its relentless opponents. The Mahatma's confession is proclaimed to the world by this Christian Government; but I wonder if this Government is also prepared to attribute to the Sermon on the Mount the slicing off by St. Peter of the ear of Malchus! Who knows how much blood might not have been shed by the disciples of the Prince of Peace if the census of arms taken by the Master had produced a tale of many more than two swords, and had his followers been more steadfast in their support of him than the self-same St. Peter who, according to the Gospels, denied him three times before cock-crow? When the guilt of Chauri-Chaura and similar unfortunate occurrences is being judged, it is necessary to take into consideration not only that which was done but also that which had been resisted. Never before in the annals of India have the people felt as intensely as they have done since the dawn of Non-Co-operation, and the marvel is not that the fury of the mob has resulted in *so much* bloodshed, but that the manhood of India has been successfully

revived with so little of it. I challenge anyone to show another instance in the history of mankind where hundreds of millions of people have been roused to stand up for their liberties and have remained so peaceful as the people of India led by Mahatma Gandhi. There is no country of Europe, with all its cold, frog blood, that would not have experienced a deluge of blood in like circumstances. That India has escaped such a deluge is due to Mahatma Gandhi and his co-workers.

CO-OPERATION

In dealing with the question of Non-Violence I have digressed and anticipated a good deal, and I must now revert to my narrative. At the Congress at Amritsar the main resolution was concerned with the Reforms, and although only four years have passed since that session, it would surprise not a few to know that in the discussions over this resolution my friend Deshbandhu Das, the leader of the Council-entry party, and my late chief, Lokmanya Tilak, were entirely opposed to co-operation and the working of the Reformed Councils, while Mahatma Gandhi had himself moved an amendment to that resolution. This was designed to commit the Congress to the principle of the co-operation of the people with the authorities in working the Reforms in response to the sentiments expressed in the Royal Proclamation. Neither side was willing to give way, and, as is usual on such occasions, the protracted discussions in the Subjects Committee were delaying the discussions in the Congress and prolonging the session. This was the first occasion, as I have already told you, on which I took part in the Congress, and for a novice my own contribution is not altogether undeserving of notice. My brother and I tried to discover a formula which could be acceptable both to Mahatma Gandhi and to Lokmanya Tilak and Deshbandhu Das. We at last succeeded in this effort, and Srijut Bepin Chandra Pal moved, and I seconded, an amendment recommending to the Congress that "the provisions of the Reforms Act be used, as far as possible, with a view to secure full responsible Government at an early date." This

cleared the air, and finally both parties agreed to support a resolution declaring that "the Congress trusts that, so far as may be possible, that people will so work the Reforms as to secure an early establishment of full responsible Government." It was with this addition that the Congress passed the resolution moved by Deshbandhu Das and seconded by Lokmanya Tilak, which declared India to be fit at the moment for full responsible Government, characterised the Reforms Act as inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing and urged that Parliament should take early steps to establish full respectable Government in India in accordance with the principle of self-determination. I have recalled these details only to show that even at Amritsar Mahatma Gandhi and his co-workers were willing to co-operate with Government so far as was possible. And yet otherwise so entirely changed was the atmosphere at this session of the Congress that after my long separation from my people I could not help being greatly impressed by the change. The Hindus and Muslims were no longer enemies for even rivals, but were comrades and brothers-in-arms. There was no longer a plethora of set speeches suggestive of midnight oil, "full of sound and fury signifying nothing." There was a new earnestness which indicated that the resolutions of the Congress were resolutions indeed, in the sense that the nation was *resolved* to act. And above all, it was clear that fear of fellowman was no longer to be the compelling motive in India, and that the only fear this land would know in future would be the fear of God. So struck was I by this amazing change that I quoted in my speech at Amritsar the couplet of a fellow-townsman of mine who had said:

صد سالہ دور چرخ تھا ساغر کا ایک دور   نکلے جو میکدے سے تو دنیا بدل گئی

(One round of the wine cup was like a century-long cycle of Time; when we left the tavern we found that the whole world had changed.)

FROM CO-OPERATION TO NON-CO-OPERATION

But so far it was only a change in the character and outlook of the people. Their policy was, however, also destined to

undergo an entire sea-change. And it was Mahatma Gandhi who at Amritsar was insisting on the people's co-operation with the authorities that was destined to be the first and, in the beginning, almost the sole advocate of Non-Co-operation. What was it that had wrought this change of policy? I must confess my feelings towards this Government had undergone a complete change during the War, and in particular since the Armistice towards the end of 1918. When now I read in the old files of the *Comrade* the publicly expressed expectations I had entertained from this Government not only at the commencement of the year 1911, but even as late as the end of 1914, it appears as if I was examining the newly discovered bones of an animal now altogether extinct. It is true that as late as in December, 1919, I had taken, with regard to co-operation with the authorities, a middle position between Mahatma Gandhi on the one side, and Deshbandhu Das and Lokmanya Tilk on the other which eventually became the position of the entire Congress. But I was even then not very hopeful of the possibility of such co-operation. I had seen only too clearly to what the co-operation of the Muslims with the authorities had led them. And I had likewise realised that what had happened at Jallianwala Bagh, in the Crawling Lane, and at the Dak Bungalow at Mananwala was not a succession of unconnected incidents in which the thoughtless fury of the officials had suddenly vented itself, but a series of acts symptomatic of the disease from which this foreign bureaucracy was inevitably suffering. I was thoroughly convinced that this disease was congenital with the system, and if the system continued such incidents were bound to recur, and Government would inevitably be a succession of Jallianwala Bagh unless the British underwent a complete change of heart. The Duke of Connaught, when he came out to India in the beginning of 1921 to open the Reformed Legislatures, appealed to us to forget and forgive. I was, and still am, prepared to forgive; but forget I could not, and would not. To forget only means for the awakened sleeper to go back to sleep and to dream the pleasant dream he had been dreaming before he had awakened to the stern reality. But Mahatma Gandhi was not yet convinced of all this, and his conversion came a little later. For many

months after the Amritsar session he continued to live in the hope that England would yet repent, and, while restoring the integrity and independence of the Khilafat, and evacuating the Jazirat-ul-Arab, England would redress the great wrong done to the people of the Punjab. In fact, it was not a mere hope that sustained him but an absolute conviction, and when he too was at last disillusioned, and would indicate in the process of preparing the programme of his constructive work a profound and thoroughgoing want of belief in the good intentions of England so that even we would suggest that perhaps he was going too far, he used to explain this by saying that he was a more recent, and therefore a more zealous, convert. When the last Petition that Muslim India addressed to England, through the Indian Khilafat Delegation in the interview that we had with the Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George, the ex-Premier of England, proved the utter futility of such appeals; and when the Punjab wrong was treated as an "error of judgment" to be rewarded by n pension paid out of India's poverty to the murderer of her innocent sons, and to the cold blooded approver of this "error" who, enjoying the safety of a Government House surrounded by armed guards, had not even the justification of General Dyer, then Mahatma Gandhi lost all faith in co-operation between the rulers and the ruled.

Much has been said and written about Non-Co-operation and, is four opponents, or even some of our friends, would not understand its significance even now, I cannot hope to enlighten them in this address. I will, therefore, content myself with saying that briefly it means that if we may not resist evil, at least we will not assist it. It is true we expect that if the Indian nation is prepared to make such sacrifices as Non-Co-operation entails, this foreign Government would be absolutely paralysed. But although we do contemplate such a result, it is little more than incidental. Our movement, even though its name suggests that it is of a negative character, is in reality not so. It is essentially of a much more positive character. It does not directly aim at the paralysis of others; its direct aim is to remove our own paralysis. Every item of the Non-Co-operation pro-

gramme, with which I shall presently have to deal, has a strong constructive as well as a destructive side, and we shall stand or fall according as we succeed in our construction or not. But if we do not destroy, or, in other words, if we continue to avail ourselves of all that the Government has constructed for the continuance of its own existence, and as a trap for our destruction, we shall neither stand nor even fall, but shall absolutely cease to exist. Even if our direct aim was to paralyse the Government it was entirely compatible with purest ethics, and even with the doctrine of Love associated with the name of Jesus Christ and now of Mahatma Gandhi. And I maintain that such a paralysis of Government is clearly possible. Friends, very early in my career as a gaol-bird I was struck with the system of co-operation followed in Indian gaols. Every prisoner gets a remission of a few days at the end of every month for "a clean bill of health" during the month; but some of the prisoners who succeed in winning the confidence and favour of the local gaol authorities are made watchmen, convict-overseers or convict-warders, and, besides enjoying other privileges during the rest of their prison life, they earn a more liberal remission of their sentence every month. Every one in this Pandal who has passed through that gateway of freedom called prison—and, I trust, there are a good many present here to-day—is familiar with the work of the convict-overseers and warders who share the duty of keeping watch and ward during the night with the paid warders employed by the gaol administration. As a rule the few paid warders pass the night enjoying tolerably sound sleep, or, at the very worst, done out their period of sentinel duty. But at the end of every half-hour the gaol resounds with the cries of the prisoners who keep the real watch and ward. "All's well!" is repeated from every corner of the gaol, and so long as this continues the paid warders can sleep the sleep of the just. And, this, my friends, is the parable of co-operation. We have lost our liberties and are kept enchained through the services of others who are as much deprived of their liberties as we ourselves, except for a few petty privileges that they seem to enjoy. Meanwhile the few foreigners who keep us in servitude can enjoy sleep and repose because the co-sharers of our servitude repeat

from time to time from every corner of India's vast Bastile the reassuring cry, "All is well!" The only difference is that whereas the convict-watchmen, overseers and warders can in this way at least secure their release from prison a little before their fellow-prisoners over whom they keep watch and ward, our co-operating friends, who are our comrades-in-slavery cannot look forward even to an earlier release. In fact, they have lost even the sense of slavery, and slavishly hung the very chains that keep them enslaved. As I wrote in the prison itself:

چھوڑ میری فکر 'غافل' رو خود اپنی قید پر
جسکو تو زیور سمجھتا ہے وہی زنجیر ہے

(Leave off worrying for me, O headless fool; weep over thine own capitivity; that which thou deemest to be an ornament is nothing less than a chain.)

A QUESTION FOR MUSLIMS

Friends, I feel certain, I have exhausted you as well as myself with this somewhat exhaustive historical narrative, commencing with the Indian Mutiny and coming down to our own era of Non-Co-operation. But in thus narrating past history I had an end in view. I cannot act the part of a dictator to any of you; and yet I want you to co-operate with me. Possessing no such personality as the Mahatma's, and being as unwilling to bind a spell over you as I am incapable of doing it, I could only lead you to the conclusions which after half a life-time of blindness and much blundering I have at last reached by demonstrating to you that our safest guide, the experience of several generations, inevitably leads us to the same. Experience must be our most cherised trophy, for it is a trophy made up of weapons that have hurt us. And here I appeal to the experience of my co-religionists in particular who are being diligently diverted from the path to which their history during the last sixty years and more has guided them. Granted that Non-Co-operation has failed, and that co-operation with our non-Muslim fellow-countrymen is a vain hope, a snare and a delusion—though I am far from granting it except for argument's sake. Still we have got to suggest an alter-

native policy. I ask them not to accept my lead but to be in their turn my guide themselves. Whither could they lead me, that is now the question! If Non-Co-operation with our foreign masters and co-operation with Indian fellow-slaves of other faiths is not possible, what is the alternative that they have to place before us to-day? Are we to "progress backwards" till we begin to walk on all fours? Shall we co-operate with our foreign rulers and fight with our non-Muslim countrymen as we used to fight before? And if we do that what hope have we of any better results than we achieved for ourselves in the settlements after the Tripoli and the Balkan Wars, or, nearer home, in the unsettlement of a "settled fact" in Bengal? No, friends that book is closed and into it we shall look no more. You have no alternative better than Non-Co-operation with the foreigner and co-operation with our neighbours, nor have I. And it is futile to waste our time in worrying over the impossible.

MR. MONTAGU'S RESIGNATION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

It is said that we can have no grievance now after the Treaty of Lausanne. You, friends, are in a better position to know how that Treaty came to be concluded than I who had to undergo for a year and a half solitary confinement in all but a technical sense, and have not been in touch with public affairs. But I have studied in some of the back numbers of the newspapers of those days something of what transpired in connection with the revision of the Treaty of Sevres while I was still in prison. You all know about the historic telegram despatched to the Secretary of State by the Government of India after consulting and receiving the general concurrence of the Local Government, including their Ministers. You will agree that it fell far short not only of Muslim aspirations and sentiments, but also of the requirements of Islamic Law, since it did not say anything about the evacuation of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, and only recommended the Sultan's suzerainty over the Holy Places. In fact, the Government of India undoubtedly, even if haltingly, admitted all this when they

said: "We are conscious that it may be impossible to satisfy India's expectations in their entirety," though Mr. Chamberlain had the impudence to say that "the terms far exceeded even the demands of the warmest friends of the Turks." And yet what a storm did the world witness over the publication of even such a telegram. The Secretary of State's resignation was demanded by the Premier, and the King Emperor "had been pleased to approve its acceptance." In other words, Mr. Montagu was ignominiously dismissed. As Reuter pointed out, "Mr. Chamberlain's announcement in the House of Commons was received with fierce welcoming cheers from the majority of the Unionists; and the 'Die-hards,' specially delighted, could hardly contain their satisfaction." "Never before," said another message of Reuter has the House of Commons re-echoed with such exultant cheering as greeted the announcement of Mr. Montagu's resignation. It emanated from the Unionist benches, but was so loud and prolonged that it seemed general. Some enthusiasts even waved handkerchiefs." The most charitable explanation with regard to the attitude of Mr. Montagu's own party; and the party that is the rising hope of such Indians as till cling to the idea of receiving freedom as the gift of the foreigner, is contained in the earlier messags of Reuter, that "Liberal and Labour members received the news without an expression of opinion." To-day it may perhaps be urged that the Government of India are as anxious as the Muslim leaders themselves to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of the questions still at issue between *Muslims* and Great Britain. But of what good is that to us so long as the Government of India is only "a subordinate branch of the British Government six thousand miles away" whose "*dictation* to the British Government" as to what line it ought *to pursue* in such matters seems to Lord Curzon "quite intolerable." *This* is what Lord Curzon wrote to Mr. Montagu before "giving him the sack," even though poor Mr. Montagu thought that he was only being let off with a warning. But evidently he had forgotten that at Denshawi there was flogging as well as hanging and that Lord Curzon's final court could be trusted not to let off such criminals as he with a warning, but to warn and hang him also for the same offence.

Not one of those believing Muslims who are dissatisfied today with our policy of Non Co-operation with Government and co-operation among the Indians could honestly say that Muslim Indian feeling received anything even approaching proper consideration at the hands of Great Britain. And yet hear what this former Viceroy of India, the same who posed as the benefactor of the Muslims in partitioning Bengal in 1905, has to say about our cry of anguish at the partitioning of the Khilafat fifteen years later. In his letter to Mr. Montagu he writes: "But the part India has sought to play or been allowed to play in this series of events passes my comprehension... Is Indian opinion always to be the final court of Muslim appeal?"

In his speech before his Cambridge constituency Mr. Montagu has said: "The Government of India were parties to the Treaty of Sevres. Had the Treaty produced peace, the Government of India would have accepted it loyally; but when it showed, *as I always knew that it would show*, that it could not produce peace, the Government of India pleaded for its revision. I ask whether the Governments of Canada, South Africa or Australia would have remained silent when the so-called peace was destroying the internal peace of their country?" Poor Mr. Montagu! How easy it is, it seems, to forget that while the Governments of Canada, South Africa and Australia are national governments, the Government of India, over which Lord Reading still presides after the dismissal of Mr. Montagu, is not a national government at all. On the contrary, it is one which was bound to lock up for six long years the greatest leader that the nation had produced for many generations, in deference to pressure from the very Imperial Government that had treated its partial support of his view in this affair with such open contempt. Dr. Sapru, too, had forgotten this patent difference between India and the Dominions, and had to be reminded of it at the Imperial Conference by the representative of a country once as distressful as our own, namely Ireland. We had ourselves urged upon Mr. Montagu the very consideration to which he referred in his Cambridge speech; but it was all in vain, and our advocacy of the same cause which the late Secretary of State advocated with equally little success

was punished in various ways by the Government in India. Those who used to tell me on these occasions that Mr. Montagu was sympathetic had to be reminded that his sympathy had proved wholly sterile. I have always held that Mr. Montagu should have resigned on any one of at least half a dozen occasions even before his ultimate dismissal, and now he tells us himself that "he had been repeatedly on the verge of resignation, but he had hesitated *because he did not wish to say to the Mohamedans of India that the solemn pledges which had been made to them were irretrievably lost.*" Nevertheless, his resignation *had* to come at last, and to-day he is not only not in the Government, but not even in the House of Commons. Can we then draw from all this any other conclusion than this, that "*the solemn pledges which had been made to us are irretrievably lost*"? But, no, they are not *irretrievably* lost. Friends, with the assistance of God, and your whole-hearted co-operation, we will yet retrieve them, or perish in the attempt.

ENGLAND AT LAUSANNE

This was in March, 1922, and although we were promised that due weight would be given to Indian opinion, I ask you to consider what was the attitude of England when six months later the brave Turks, relying not upon the promises of Great Britain, but upon God's grace and their own self-sacrifice and courage, drove Britain's brutal nominees into the sea? You all know that better than I do, and I do not propose to detain you over that. Beaten on the field of battle, England now sought to deprive the Turks of the fruits of victory on the conference-table of diplomacy. But here, too, God helped those who helped themselves, and the Treaty of Lausanne proved that the Turks were not only warriors but statesmen as well. Let us hear what Lord Curzon has to say himself of the reasons that brought about the Treaty of Lausanne. Did the English who had commissioned Greece after the Armistice to rob the Turks of Thrace and even of their homelands in Asia Minor; who were at one time actually considering the question of handing overConstantinople to them;

and who had appealed in vain to the Dominions to fight their battle against the now victorious Turks when India could no longer be trusted to make cannon-fodder of her sons after the Karachi Trial—did the English even now repent of relent? The difference between the conditions under which other treaties, including that of Sevres, were imposed and those in which the Lausanne Settlement was arrived at was pointed out by Lord Curzon at the Imperial Conference in the following words:—

> Such (dictation of terms at the point of the bayonet) had been the case with all the previous post-war treaties. These had in each case been drawn up by the victorious Powers, sitting, so to speak, on the seat of judgment, in the absence of the culprit, and imposing what penalty or what settlement they chose. Only when the terms had been drawn up was the beaten enemy admitted to be told his sentence and to make the conventional protest of the doomed man. Such, indeed, was the environment in which the original Treaty of Sevres was drawn up and signed, though never ratified by the Turkish representatives. Far otherwise was it at Lausanne. There the Turks sat at the table on a footing of equality with all the other Powers. Every article of the Treaty had to be debated with and explained to them. Agreement had to be achieved not by brandishing the big stick but by discussion, persuasion and compromise.

Commenting upon Lord Curzon's defence of the Treaty of Lausanne and of his praise of Allied diplomacy, which was, according to him, reluctant to break up the Conference on important, but not vital, points, and to revert to a state of war, an Indian newspaper, which is not noted for any excess of sympathy with the Turks, wrote as follows:—

> No credit can be given to such pacific and discreet diplomacy when it was based on unwillingness to fight. As Lord Curzon said, "the Turks knew very well that the Allies had no stomach for further fighting; on the contrary, they were very nervous about the bellicose temper of the extremist elements among the Turks." "The Allies were never certain," said the Foreign Secretary, "how far the genuine desire of the leading Turks for peace would control the unruly Nationalist and extremist elements." It will thus appear that the Turks obtained what they wanted literally at the point of the sword and the role of the conquerors and the role of the conquered was reversed at Lausanne. It was the Turks who dictated the terms of the Treaty, and the Allies, who dictated the terms of the other post-war treaties, had to accept them... As a matter of fact the big stick was brandished by the Turks at Lausanne and the Allies "made the conventional protest of the doomed man."

Replying to the severe criticism of the Treaty by those "whose motives in making the attack are not free from criticism," he said that "it was the best treaty that could be obtained in the circumstances."

Thus it is once more clear that the Turks secured what they did at Lausanne not because of any regard on the part of England for justice to the Turks, or for the religious obligations and sentiments of Indian Muslims with regard to the Khilafat, but in spite of England's open hostility towards the Turks and utter disregard of the requirements of Islam. Lord Curzon would have once more brandished the big stick; but, sad to relate, it had changed hands.

I have purposely dealt exclusively with a matter concerning the special interests of Muslims and affecting their extra-territorial sympathies, for it is obvious that the Treaty of Lausanne, far from settling our national affairs and satisfying our national requirements common to all Indian communities, does not even settle the peculiarly Muslim and religious issue of the Jazirat-ul-Arab. But after all, the issues that are our common national issues far exceed in number those that concern the Muslims alone. All that the Treaty of Lausanne has done is to declare that the Turks have not lost their Swaraj as we had done more than a century ago, and as they themselves were within an ace of doing. The Khilafat Committee's demands, and, in particular the religious requirements with regard to the Jazirat-ul-Arab, still remain unsatisfied. But even if all this had been done, could the Muslims give up Non-Co-operation with Government and co-operation with other Indian communities? In the first place, that would be an unspeakably shameful breach of faith with their non-Muslim brethren of whose help they have so willingly availed themselves. And, in the next place, Indian Muslims would be proving that, while they were so anxious for the security of the Turks' and the Arabs' Swaraj, they were indifferent to their own! Well could it, then, be said of them:

تو کار زمین رانکو ساختی   کہ با آسمان نیز پر راختی

(Hast thou arranged the affairs of the earth so well that thou meddlest in those of heaven as well?)

THE TERRIBLE ALTERNATIVE TO NON-CO-OPERATION

Friends, once more I have perhaps exhausted your patience; but my excuse for it is that I want the Muslims who are being asked to-day to discard the policy of Non-Co-operation with England to confront facts before they reverse a decision to which their sad experiences of co-operation with England had driven them. It is as clear as daylight that so long as India is not an equal partner with England and the Dominions in the Empire, and so long as her Government is but "a subordinate branch of the British Government six thousand miles away," we cannot be satisfied with the goodwill of the Government of India even if it is proved to the hilt. Besides loyalty to a foreign Government, there are other loyalties as well, and so long as Muslims in India are liable to be punished for disloyalty to Government because they are loyal to their God and to His Last Prophet, as we ourselves were punished at Karachi, and so long as the Holy Land of Islam is under the control of non-Muslim mandatories when we ourselves had been given God's own mandate for it by His Last Messenger, as a deathbed injunction, there is no alternative to Non-Violent Non-Co-operation but one, and that, friends, is the terrible alternative of war. Since the vast bulk of those who try to discredit our policy do so because they are slaves to the fear of Government and, being unwilling to make *any* sacrifice, could not even dream of adopting that terrible alternative, let us hear no more of a change of policy.

MUSLIM CO-OPERATION WITH NON-MUSLIMS

And if we may not co-operate with Great Britain, is it expedient, to put it on the lowest plane, to cease to co-operate with our non-Muslim brethren? What is it that has happened since that staunch Hindu, Mahatma Gandhi, went to gaol for advocating the cause of Islam that we must cease to co-operate with his co-religionists? I know that Hindu-Muslim relations to-day are not precisely those that they were two years ago.

But is it possible for any honest and true patriotic Indian to say that either community is wholly blameless, and that the guilt is entirely one community's? Friends, I do not believe in diplomacy, and certainly not in that variety of it which is called secret diplomacy. I do not wish to imitate Sir Roger de Coverly and put you off with the diplomatic dictum: "Much can be said on both sides of the question. Most regrettable events have unfortunately occurred in Malabar, at Multan, at Agra, at Saharanpur and elsewhere, and I am prepared to support the creation of a national tribunal to judge the respective guilt of the two communities. For it cannot be gainsaid even by the community that has suffered the most that complaints have been made by members of the other community as well and obviously it would neither be fair nor productive of any satisfactory result if either community is saddled with all the guilt and denounced without an adequate enquiry. I did not shrink at Delhi from proposing the appointment of a truly representative Committee of Enquiry; but for reasons which it is not necessary to state here no result has yet been achieved of such a committee's appointment. Two things are, however, patent. The law courts established by Government cannot stop their work while we adjudge the guilt of the two communities. And while it is difficult to arrive at the truth by a national enquiry *after* witnesses have given their testimony, true or false, on oath before the courts of law of the Government, reconciliation itself, which is even more important than the investigation of the truth, is not made easy by the punishment awarded to those who are found guilty by such courts, not unoften on evidence which is not free from suspicion.

What then is to be done? I have already told you that to accept the version of one party is neither *fair*, *nor would it help* us in creating in the other party whose version was disbelieved without any enquiry a disposition towards reconciliation and reform. The only remedy that I can suggest for instant adoption is also the surest, and it was this which was all but adopted towards the end of our discussions at *Delhi* in the Committee appointed to consider this question. Even after we had decided

that a Committee of Enquiry should visit the places where regrettable incidents had followed Hindu-Muslim dissensions, and after we had even nominated the members of this Committee, we were within an ace of cancelling all this because we noted at a later stage of our deliberations a welcome change in the attitude of the leaders on the two sides. There was now a desire to let bygones be bygones and heartily co-operate for the attainment of Swaraj, as they had been doing two years previously. Obviously, the protagonists on the two sides had once more had glimpse of that unity of which the Mahatma was at once the chief preacher and the best symbol, and the prospect of gaining party-victories once more appeared mean and contemptible in their eyes. But a difference arose on a party issue and they parted again. Friends, I pray that God may grant them once more a glimpse of that unity, and that this time it may not be as fleeting as it had been before. Nay, I pray that they may keep even before them a picture of that unity and the glorious vistas of that freedom which can be seen only through the avenue of national unity, so that all else that is of fair seeming, but which is associated with slavery, may lose its charm for them and he blotted out for all eternity.

THE PETTINESS OF DISTURBING ISSUES

Believe me, it is not by tawdry, tinselled rhetoric that I hope to settle such vital issues. But, although the issue of Hindu-Muslim unity is vital, and, in fact, the most vital that we have to settle, the issues which disturb that unity are contemptibly petty. Nothing makes me more ashamed than the pettiness of these issues, and I confess I find it difficult to refute the calumny of our enemies that we are unfit for responsible Government when I contemplate their potency for mischief side by side with their pettiness. Far be it from me to sneer at the modes of worship of my fellow-men ; but I feel unspeakably depressed when I think that there are fellow-countrymen of mine, including my own co-religionists, who would jeopardise the recovery of our lost liberty, including religious liberty itself, for

the sake of the satisfaction they seem to derive out of cutting a branch of *pipal* tree overhanging a public thoroughfare and interfering with the passage of a pole of ridiculous length, or out of beating tom-toms and blowing trumpets before a house of worship at prayer-time while moving in a procession. Friends, if we cannot acquire a better sense of proportion let us be honest, at least with ourselves if not with others, and give up all thought of freedom. We must not talk of Swaraj even within the Empire, let alone out of it. What is Kenya to slaves like us or we to Kenya? Why need we hanker after a place in the King-Emperor's palace when we are not even fit for a place in his stables? And what is it to us if the Holy Land of Islam should attract many a casino and *cafe chantant*, or the new warden of the Muslims' Holy of Halies should become one of the long tale of impotent potentates maintained by an Imperial Government only to be pushed off their ancestral thrones whenever they should forget themselves and think that God has made them men and not merely puppets in an imperial show. If *alams* and *pipal* trees and noisy processions are our "horizon's utter sum," then all our Congress and Khilafat Committees are mere mockery.

"Let us ring down—the farce is nothing worth."

Let us close this chapter of childish make-beliefs, and, taking the first train back home, let us devote ourselves henceforward to the realisation of the ideal of petty self-concern which alone befits a nation of slaves. Let us at least not take the sacred name of Liberty in vain. Let us add our confession to the claim of our opponents, and admit that God, Whom the great religious teachers of the East in which all the existing religions have had their source, had taught us to regard as just, has yet been so unjust to a fifth of mankind that He has made them totally unfit for self-rule, and has left it to His white creatures hailing from Europe to correct His mistake, and carry on for all time the administration of India. But if we do not want to drag our spiritual ancestors into the mire along with ourselves and to blaspheme a just God, let us elevate ourselves to the height of our ideals and lift the masses instead of sinking down to their low level,

THE ROOT OF EVIL

But since I have referred to the low level of the masses, let me say this much for them that what I wrote in 1904 in criticising the education given in the Indian universities is still true, and even to-day "the greater portion of bigotry agitates not the bosoms of the ignorant and the illiterate but excites to fury and to madness the little-learned of the land." And it is not the love of our own religion that makes us quarrel with our fellow-countrymen of other faiths, but self-love and petty personal ambition. "The coming of the Mahatma" had meant the destruction of "the kingdom of the nations" and the foundation in their place of the one united Kingdom of the Nation to be whose chief servant was his great glory. But these little "kings" who had lost their little "thrones" were not reconciled to the idea of national service under the banner of the Nation's chief servant, and were pining for restoration. So long as Mahatma Gandhi and his principal co-workers were free they had not the courage to raise the standard of revolt and there was no room for them in the economy of the Indian world except as openly despised slaves of the foreigner or as secretly discontented adherents of the National Federation. And so they chose the latter alternative. But with the Mahatma immurred at Yarvada, they reasserted themselves, and since they could not hope to occupy his position, they have persistently, though not professedly, addressed their appeals to communal passions and jealousies in order to destroy the National Federation and hasten the recovery of their petty principalities. Before the advent of Mahatma Gandhi several streams, some large and some small, were running more or less parallel to each other, and little boats were being rowed on them. But soon after his advent, almost all of them were diverted into one channel and became tributaries of a mighty river rapidly moving on to join the sea. On the broad bosom of this Ganges there sailed a powerful ship, manned by lusty sailors, captained by the Mahatma and flying the National flag. What the petty ambitions of petty men have been urging ever since the Mahatma's incarceration is that we should scrap the big ship and take to the little row-boats again. But since

these little boats are not safe enough craft for the mighty river hurrying on towards the sea, they propose a revolution in Nature itself, and ask that the great river would flow back into its old tributaries. But Nature cannot be thwarted, and the futility of the desire to make the Ganges flow backwards is a thing known even to our village fools. In the name of this Congress, and of the Indian Nation, nay, even in the name of that Destiny which shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we may, I warn this little breed of men that, God willing, they will never succeed, and that the Indian Nation cannot look upon their insidious activities with unconcern.

TOLERATION AND FRATERNAL SELF-SACRIFICE

Friends, to punish the guilty is not without its advantages even in the domain of politics ; but the surest remedy for political disunion is, as I have already suggested, to create on all sides a disposition to forget and forgive. But this is not all, and if we desire to prevent a recurrence of regrettable incidents we must remove the causes of friction. Conformity in all things is only too often desired, and this not only by the bigots, but also by some of the most large-hearted of men. Religious reformers have at all times betrayed a fatal weakness for comprehension or the preparation of a religious compound formed of many simples gathered from many different sources. They have hoped that by adopting a policy of inclusion they would be able to form a faith embracing doctrines culled from diverse faiths and acceptable to all the followers of all these faiths. That is how they hope to attain uniformity and secure conformity. But history has shown that the cause of peace and unity has not been greatly furthered by the formation of such eclectic faiths. Only too often have they added one more to the warring creeds existing before and have only increased the disunion they were creating. Such well-intentioned failures have at last made people fall back upon toleration. This is not the indifferentism and absence of strong convictions which often pass for toleration, but a far more positive principle in life which co-exists with beliefs passionately

held. I could not define it better than by quoting an American who declared to a fellow-countryman of his holding very different views to his own: "I strongly disagree with every word of what you say; but I shall fight, sir, to the last drop of my blood for maintaining your right to say it!" That, friends, is the best definition of toleration. The Quran which calls upon Muslims even to fight in defence of their Faith whenever their freedom of faith is assailed or jeopardised, sums up its teaching on tolerance in the words: "To you your faith, to me mine." If we all agreed to act upon this principle, and at the same time emphasised the features common to different faiths and the spirituality characteristic of all, there would be no strife in the world but peace and tranquillity everywhere.

APPLICATION OF THIS PRINCIPLE TO OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Let us apply this principle to some of the outstanding issues between the various communities of India. If, for instance, processions can be taken out on public roads and no objection is taken to music being played thereon, a Muslim should not object to a procession with music taken out by Hindus, or by other non-Muslim neighbours of his, unless it interferes with his own exercise of some recognised right such as conducting Divine Service in a fitting manner. If, again, a long pole can be carried in procession through the streets without danger to life and limb, no non-Muslim should object to it if it is so carried "with musical honours." But then the Muslim indulging in such practices which are, to say the least of it, of doubtful religious validity, have no right to demand that a non-Muslim neighbour of theirs should permit the lopping off of the branches of a tree which he holds sacred, whether with reason or without it, and which is growing on his land and is his property. If there is no law against smoking in public places, no Parsi should object to a non-Parsi's lighting a cigarette in a street even though he himself holds fire to be too sacred an element to be defiled in this way. Similarly, if it is no offence to slaughter animals, and a man kills

a fowl, or a cow, or a pig, or kills any animal to provide food for himself or for others or for sacrificial purposes or in a particular manner not involving cruelty to animals, his neighbour should not object to it on the ground that he holds all life too sacred to be destroyed, or that he looks upon the cow as upon a mother, or that he considers a pig too unclean to be eaten, or that he is required by his own religion to kill animals in a different manner to his neighbour's. In all these cases it is, of course, presumed that the animal slaughtered is the property of the man who slaughters it or causes it to be slaughtered and not his neighbour's whose property he may not unlawfully seize and use or destroy. But we have not, alas, reached a stage of toleration in India when the free exercise of right by one of us can escape being resented by some others. In fact, the worst of it is that some of us while they insist upon the exercise of their right, sometimes exercise it with the desire to annoy their neighbours, and in a manner that is sure to annoy them. The jeering at men of other faiths when one is taking out a procession required or sanctioned by our own faith, the beating of tom-toms and playing other instruments, which often produce more noise than music, wih special vigour before a house of worship of anobter community, and particularly when Divine Service or some other religious rite is in progress and is likely to be thereby disturbed; the needless lopping off of trees held sacred by Hindus which overhang public thoroughfares, or doing it in an exultant manner; the blowing of cigarette smoke in the face of, or to close to a Parsi or a Sikh; the wanton destruction of a good deal of animal life in the sight or immediate neighbourhood of Jains; carrying a garlanded cow in procession through a locality inhabited by Hindus as well for purposes of slaughter; or slaughtering it in a place where Hindus cannot help seeing it—these and many other such are things that occur only too frequently whenever there is a tension of feeling between the communities concerned. And provocation and insolent exultation of the nature described above often lead to hot words, and not seldom to blows which sometimes end in loss of human life.

There can be no measure sufficiently comprehensive to

safeguard public tranquillity and peace in all such cases, and can think of no Notional pact embracing all such situations, even if it is permitted to assume inordinate proportions, and to include details that must make us the laughing-stock of the world. The best remedy, I must repeat, is the creation of the correct spirit in which the different communities exercise their rights. But it is possible for a national body such as the Congress to deal with some of the principal causes of friction, and to remove them by bringing about an agreement between leaders of the communities concerned. And this it must do. But, while attempting to influence public opinion, and to regulate public action through the agency of such leaders, with courage and confidence, a body like the Congress must be careful not to demand from any community that it should relinquish any rights which may, in the present circumstances, involve a sacrifice far beyond its capacity. It must be remembered that Swaraj, although it is our destined goal, and is soon likely to be in sight, has yet to be won, and before it is won we have no sanctions of which we can make use like a government. We must depend exclusively upon persuasion and example. But even if we had a government of our own, it could not rightly, or even successfully, compel large sections of the people to give up the exercise of any right unless it provided for them corresponding facilities in some other direction.

COW-KILLING

The question of cow-killing is an instance in point. I know how sacred a cow is in the eyes of my Hindu brothers, and who knows better than my brother and myself how anxious our absent chief was to secure its preservation? His action in so selflessly leading the Khilafat movement was no doubt characteristically generous and altruistic; but he himself used to say that he was trying to protect the cow of the Muslims, which was their Khilafat, so that this grateful community which had learnt from its Scriptures that there could be no return to kindness save kindness, would be induced to protect his own cow in return. This was, however, only Mahatma Gandhi's way of emphasising

his love for the cow. And even before he so picturesquely called the Khilafat our cow my brother and I had decided not to be any party to cow-killing ourselves. No beef is consumed since then in our house even by our servants, and we consider it our duty to ask our co-religionists to act similarly. As for sacrificing cows, my brother and I have never done it, but have always sacrificed goats, since a sacrifice of some such animal is a recognised religious duty. Much can be done in this way, and we have learnt by experience during the three or four years following the Hindu-Muslim *entente* and co-operation that it is not difficult to reduce cow-sacrifice, even before Swaraj is won, to insignificant proportions.

But, much as I desire that even ordinary cow-killing throughout the year for the purpose of providing food should be altogether discontinued, or, at least, reduced to similarly meagre proportions, I am only too conscious of the fact that in looking forward to an early realisation of my wishes I am hoping against hope. Muslims in India who can afford to purchase the dearer mutton eat beef only on rare occasions. But for the poorer towns-folk among the Muslims it is the staple food. Coming from the centre of Rohilkhand, or the land of the Rohillas, I know how difficult it is for them to discontinue the use of beef in the present circumstances. The Pathan cannot suppress his surprise when he comes across people in India who "eat corn with corn"; and Rampur wags say: "Let there be meat, even if it be a dog's." When following the fashion of British Indian municipalities, Rampur also closed many meat shops and opened in their place a central Meat Market, it was found difficult to cope with the demand for beef, and so disastrous proved the results of a keen competition for the reduced supply that the *Markeet*, as it used to be called, was now derisively rechristened *Marpet!* In the case of this class of Muslims the use of beef is at present a more or less acutely felt economic necessity.

The only safe and sure way of stopping cow-killing in this case is to take steps to lower the price of mutton which is prohibitively high, and thus reduce the very large margin that there is at present between the prices of mutton and beef. I am far

from desiring that the cost of living should be still further increased for any section of this impoverished land, not excluding my own community, which is admittedly one of the poorest; but I cannot help pointing out that by far the most numerous owners of cows are the Hindus, and that if they did not sell cows after they had ceased to give milk, there would be much less cow-killing than there is to-day. Even now we can encourage goat and sheep breeding in order to save the cow, but when we can frame our budgets for a Swaraj government it should be a comparatively easy matter to utilise a considerable portion of the savings from Military expenditure for the same purpose. Nevertheless I appeal to my co-religionists even to-day to discontinue the use of beef and not to wait until Swaraj is won when their sacrifice would be worth much less. The joint family system of India and not the free competition of the Manchester school must be our social and political ideal for India's different communities. But if there is to be competition among the communities that form the Indian joint family, let it be a competition in forbearance and self-sacrifice, and I maintain that the community which willingly surrenders more of its cherished rights and strongly entertained sentiments for the sake of sister communities and the peace and harmony of India will prove the most invincible in the end.

ADJUSTMENT OF COMMUNAL SHARES IN REPRESENTATIVE BODIES AND IN THE ADMINISTRATION

I have already explained to you what I think about the main cause of communal quarrels and the share of the educated classes in misleading the masses and using them in order to serve their personal ambitions. But matters like cow-killing and processions with music are not the only things that provide sources of friction. The adjustment of communal shares in representative institutions, local, provincial and all-India, and in the administration also, gives rise to bitter communal dissensions, and here it is clearly impossible to shift the blame on to the masses. Once more personal ambitions well or ill-disguised as communal interests, play a great part, and specious phrases, such as greater

efficiency and superior educational qualifications, are used to cover the injustice intended. This is all the more surprising because similar pretexts when put forward by the foreign bureaucrats are mercilessly exposed by the selfsame people. Since this fallacy of the higher efficiency of monopolists has not yet received its quietus I am compelled to say that the intelligence of the few can never be a proper safeguard of the interests of the many. And when people are not actuated by motives of broad-minded patriotism, the superior intelligence of one group or section cannot but be regarded by other groups and sections as a rather dangerous possession. It may, however, be that even where the motives are pure they are none the less suspect. That, friends, is our *karma*, the legacy left by the injustice of past generations, and instead of taking undue offence, we must live down such reputation. In politics as in business, credit has first to be established, and a good balance-sheet and a moderately good dividend are far more useful in the long run than the most attractive prospectus. We could have gone much farther on the road to liberty and self-rule if minorities had been quite sure of the company which they were being invited to join. But the common platform of the Congress has now provided an excellent opportunity to all of us to prove the patriotic character of our motives, and however long it may be before we succeed in establishing our credit, nothing can be done without it; and losing our temper over unmerited suspicions, or hustling those who entertain them and trying to jockey them into an expression of confidence that they do not yet feel in us is poor business.

The Lucknow Compact which forced the hands even of the bureaucracy and compelled it to agree to such poor reforms as have been doled out to India would in all likelihood suffice for the present for such of us as have decided to enter the legislatures; and even if it does not, this should spur us on to quicken the pace and try to reach our national destination of Swaraj all the earlier so that we may readjust communal shares in representative bodies. Friends, let me tell you frankly that I do not consider it likely that for some time yet we can afford to dispense with separate electorates. But I can assure you no

one would rejoice more than myself on the day that the minorities themselves announced that they needed no such protection. It may perhaps help you to judge of my *bona fides* in this matter if I tell you that I had strongly urged the adoption of the Indian plan for the protection of the Christian minorities in the Eastern Vilayets of Turkey known as Armenia.

But two intermediate steps may be taken before we abolish separate electorates altogether. The first is that the minorities should be free to elect any Indian as their representative. I shall deem it a great honour the day a non-Muslim minority elects me in preference to its own members to represent it in the national assembly. And I know of no Muslim to whom I could give my vote with greater confidence than to that great Khilafatist, Mahatma Gandhi.

Another step that we could well take would be the progressive creation of mixed electorates, gradually to replace separate electorates. Some of you may perhaps remember that I had opposed the Rt. Hon. Syed Ameer Ali who did not wish to risk any seat by agreeing to the retention of some mixed electorates, and wanted safe, even if fewer, seats for the Muslims when the Minto-Morley Reforms were being discussed. As inter-communal relations improved the number of seats thrown open for contest in mixed electorates may be increased and those allotted to separate electorates decreased, till all come to be contested in mixed territorial electorates. The same policy should be adopted in throwing administrative posts open from communal to general competition.

All the foregoing considerations have to be kept in view in dealing with the composition of local bodies where, although the issues may often be petty, the passions of the people concerned are more liable to be excited.

A sad enough confirmation of this is furnished by the unfortunate dissensions in the Punjab over the distribution of municipal seats. The conditions in that province sometimes make me wonder whether Jallianwalla Bagh and the Crawling Lane are really situated in the Punjab.

MENTAL MYOPIA

In the short passage which I quoted in the earlier part of this address from another address of mine, delivered as long ago as in 1904, I had warned my audience against placing any reliance on the "misleading unity of opposition", and I would be last person to believe that we can remain a united people merely by feeding on the memory of Martial Law terrors. Many a coalition formed in opposition and adversity has broken down after the first flush of victory at the polls and in the very first days of Government, and if Swaraj is not only to be won, but also to be retained thereafter, our unity must be based on something more lasting than the memories of common suffering. And yet I am compelled to remind both Hindus and Muslims who complain so bitterly to-day of one another's injustice that I know of nothing more difficult for either to endure from the other than the cold-blooded decision taken by General Dyer to shoot and to shoot strong at Jallianwalla Bagh and the calculated national humiliation of the Crawling Lane. It seems to me that we in the North suffer from a mental myopia, and as we move forward our sufferings are left behind, and gradually recede into obscurity, so that even at a very short distance of time the troubles of to-day blot out all recollection of the terrors of yesterday. And what is worse, each community remembers only that which it has itself suffered ; retaining in its memory no record of the sufferings it had itself caused to others.

THE COMMUNITY OF THE BADMASHES

But in referring thus to communities we are apt to forget that it is not communities that cause suffering to other communities in the course of popular affrays, but rowdy elements of India's population which cause injury to the peace-loving. The *badmashes* belong to no community but form a distinct community of their own, and to it all is grist that comes to the mill. I was greatly impressed by an article contributed by Lala Lajpatrai from his American exile during the War when

Hindu monied classes had suffered greatly in some districts of the Punjab from the depredations of Muslim *badmashes*. There was great danger of intercommunal strife, but the Lalaji hastened to point out that the Hindu sufferers had not suffered because they were Hindus but because they belonged to the monied classes. It was a case of the Haves and the Have-Nots and not a case of the Hindus and the Muslims. This has always to be borne in mind, particularly when there are not only the two contending parties but a third as well, which laughs just as heartily as we fight and abuse one another. Dr. Tagore has spoken a great deal since the outbreak of rowdyism in the North on the subject of intercommunal quarrels ; but the reports of his lectures made me doubt a little whether he remembered what he wrote on the same subject when similar rowdyism, but more deliberate and previously planned, had broken out over cow-killing in Bihar in 1917. He happened to be travelling in a compartment shared with him by a British military officer who sneered at Indian aspirations and asked the Poet how his fellow-countrymen could talk of Swaraj when he, a foreigner, had to be called in every now and then to take his troops to the disturbed areas and keep the peace between Indians of different faiths. Then, at least, the Post remembered that there was a third who laughed while we suffered, and reminded the British officer of his existence. The latter asked whether there were no such quarrels before the advent of the British, and the Poet admitted their previous existence as well but he was then prompt to point out that there was one difference. They quarrelled even then, but they did not let many sons go down upon their wrath because the moment they recovered their lost tempers they also recollected that they had to live together for better or worse, and since life would be infinitely dull without more or less friendly intercourse, the sooner they made up their differences and became friends again the better. But ever since the *tertius gaudens* had come on the scene such quarrels had become more frequent and such reconciliations fewer and farther between.

THE HAND OF ESAU AND THE VOICE OF JACOB

European husbands and Indian wives have a horror of that triangular family life in which the third side is represented by the mother-in-law. Imagine then the blessed state of that union in which the mother-in-law is not only a permanent feature of family life, but in which she alone runs the household. And worse than all, the mother-in-law that makes each of us pine for single blessedness combines *two* distinct natures in *one* person, and with ever ready sympathy consoles either party, as the occasion demands, and, better still, condemns the other, in joint role of the mother of *both* ! This would indeed be matter for laughter if we had only sense enough to be the dupes of this double-dealing mother-in-law. But the moment a cow is killed by a Muslim in a provocative manner, or a noisy procession is taken out by a Hindu in front of a mosque where prayer may be going on, we are ready to rush at one another's throats forgetting that Muslims have never been known to be wanting when it was their own co-religionists that had to be denounced to the Government as seditionists and rebels, and that Hindus have had no better record of communal cohesion in similar circumstances. Our own sufferings have taught us that there is never a lack of one's co-religionists to do all the dirty work that may be required of them, and when a Muslim is so ready to hurt a brother Muslim, or, for that matter, the entire Muslim community, why need we be surprised if a Hindu is employed to do the same ? No, friends, like *badmashes*, traitors belong to no community, but form a tribe of their own. Some of you must have read Labour's denunciation of "International Finance." We have even better reason to denounce "Inter-Communal Goondaism." A Muslim may throw beef during the night into a temple or break an idol, and yet the Muslim community may be just as innocent of this provoking sacrilege as the Hindu community itself ; and in similar circumstances the Hindu community may be wholly blameless even though a Hindu certainly threw pork into a mosque or desecrated the Holy Quran.

But even more clear than this is the case of a Muslim Minister who may have shown favouritism towards Muslims in

the matter of patronage, and of a Hindu Minister similarly showing undue favour to Hindus. Obviously they are members of a foreign Government whatever caste-mark they may bear. The hands are the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob. And yet the people of a province that has still to stop the pensions of a Dyer and an O'Dwyer are prepared to co-operate with those who insist on paying for Indian murder out of Indian funds, and to cease to co-operate with their neighbours and fellow-sufferers only because a Minister who happens to belong to the community of the latter dispenses such petty patronage as the Reforms empower him to do in a manner that does not meet with their approval. After this one wonders what Non-Co-operation means. When the Congress publicly is welcoming Indians who resign their posts, even though it thinks it is perhaps too much just yet to call upon them to resign, there are people who call themselves Congressmen but forget all that Mahatma Gandhi had taught them of Non-Co-operation only because a Minister in their province is giving a few more petty posts to members of his own community than they think he ought to do. Friends, it is not a little embarrassing to me that this Minister happens to be a co-religionist of mine ; but believe me, I would have felt even more ashamed than I now feel embarrassed if the complaint of such petty posts had come from my co-religionists. Hakim Ajmal Khan Saheb, for whose speedy and complete recovery we all pray, has related to me what unspeakable shame he felt when co-religionists of his and mine had the hardihood to show some scratches on the walls of the mosques at Multan and some broken pitchers in justification of their counter-claim that if Hindu temples had been destroyed their own mosques did not altogether escape.

SANGHATAN

Having explained my own attitude at such length I do not think I am called upon to say much about the Sanghatan. I have certainly never publicly opposed it, and if anyone thinks so he is mistaken, and must have been misled by some ill-reported

speech or interview. This is entirely an affair of my Hindu brethren, and if they think they need a Sanghatan they should be allowed a perfectly free hand in the matter. Every community is entitled to undertake such social reform as it needs, and if the Sanghatan is organised to remove untouchability and to provide for the speedy assimilation of the Antyaj and their complete absorption into Hindu society, I must rejoice at it both as a Muslim and as a Congressman. Ever since the Congress at Nagpur called upon the Hindu delegates "to make a special effort to rid Hinduism of the reproach of untouchability" and "respectfully urged the religious heads to help the growing desire to reform Hinduism in the matter of its treatment of the suppressed classes," this question has enlisted the direct interest and sympathy of the Congress. I remember very well that towards the closing months of the year 1921, Mahatma Gandhi was making the removal of untouchability the test of the Hindus yearning for Swaraj, and if orthodox Hindu religious bodies have now seriously decided to make the required reform in Hinduism, it is bound to rejoice the hearts of that large-hearted Hindu and of all his followers.

But I cannot help recalling that this matter remained in abeyance for a considerable time, and that it was not taken up with any great zeal until after the tragic events in Malabar had caused some months later a wave of indignation and resentment to sweep over the distant Punjab and Multan Hindus had themselves suffered from the unruly passions of the Muslim mob. It is this combination of circumstances which causes uneasiness to many of those who yearn for the unification of India and know how little weight our recently achieved unity can just yet sustain. A broken limb which has just come out of a steel frame should not be too severely strained. We may not believe every suspicion or rumour, but we must not overlook their potency for mischief if they are not quickly removed or disproved and there is no doubt that people are busy creating the suspicion that the removal of untouchability is not intended to result in the absorption of the suppressed classes into Hindu society, but merely to use them as auxiliaries on the Hindu side in future affrays. This being so,

I ask if there is no ground for the uneasiness of Mahatma Gandhi's followers who have been sedulously taught, in the words of our resolution at Nagpur, "to lay special emphasis on NON-VIOLENCE being an integral part of the Non-Co-operation Resolution," and to invite the attention of the people to the fact that "NON-VIOLENCE in word and deed is as essential between the people themselves as in respect of the Government," and, finally, that "the spirit of violence is not only contrary to the growth of a true spirit of democracy, but actually retards the enforcement (if necessary) of the other stages of Non-Co-operation." If in removing the reproach of untouchability we give cause to the world to reproach us with adding to pre-existing violence, will it not sadden the heart of the Mahatma? Friends, let us befriend the suppressed classes for their own injured sakes and not for the sake of injuring others or even avenging our own injuries.

Another feature of the Sanghatan movement is the increase of interest in physical culture. This is all to the good, and if flabbiness and cowardice can be removed from any section of the Indian people there is cause only for joy. Here too, however, there arises the question of the spirit, and I am sincerely glad that the frank discussions at Delhi last September gave an opportunity to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to proclaim to the world that he himself favours the creation of common *akharas* in which young men of all communities can take their share. As for the protection of life and property and—I regret that I should have to add—the honour of our sisters, he again proclaimed his original intention that common territorial Civic Guards should be formed. It was only because he was told that the Hindu Sabba by which his motion was being discussed could not constitutionally bind other communities that he altered his resolution and agreed to the creation of Hindu Guards.

SENSE OF HONOUR OF OUR BADMASHES

But let me say one word on the subject of the protection of the honour of our women before I take leave of the Sanghatan question, and let me preface my last word on the subject with

the admission that it is not really mine but my wife's. At Almora, where she was addressing a ladies' meeting composed mainly of her Hindu sisters, she said that if in a place such as Almora, where Muslims form a very insignificant minority, she found that an anti-Muslim riot had broken out, and her male relations were not available to help her to protect her own or her daughter's honour, she would unhesitatingly appeal to the first Hindu as to a brother even if she knew him to be a *badmash* and ask him to take her and her children under his personal protection. She said she had enough confidence in the sense of honour even of India's *badmashes* and in their "sportsmanship" so to speak, and I doubt if there are many *badmashes* in India on whom such a personal appeal of a sister in distress will fail to have any effect. Friends, trust disarms even wickedness and succeeds where six-chambered revolvers fail, and Shakespeare knew human nature better than some of us seem to do when he wrote:

"There is a soul of goodness in things evil."

I cannot do better than to appeal to my sisters to teach us to trust each other more than we do at present, and by their own courageous confidence develop in the worst of us that God-given "soul of goodness."

SHUDDHI

Another movement that has affected Hindu-Muslim relations is Shuddhi. I myself believe in a missionary religion, and by a missionary religion should be taken to mean one in which, in the words of Professor Max Muller, the spreading of the truth and the conversion of unbelievers are raised to the rank of a sacred duty. It is the spirit of truth in the hearts of believers which cannot rest unless it manifests itself in thought, word and deed, which is not satisfied till it has carried its message to every human soul, till what it believes to be the truth is accepted as the truth by all the members of the human family. Christianity and Buddhism as well as Islam are known to missionary religions, but Judaism, Zoroastrianism and Hinduism are generally regarded as non-missionary.

Now, this has been my complaint for a long time against Hinduism, and on one occasion, lecturing at Allahabad in 1907, I had pointed out the contrast between Muslims and Hindus, by saying that the worst that could be said of a Muslim was that he had a tasteless mess which he called a dish fit for kings, and wanted all to share it with him, thrusting it down the throats of such as did not relish it and would rather not have it, while his Hindu brother who prided himself on his cookery, retired into the privacy of his kitchen and greedily devoured all that he had cooked, without permitting even the shadow of his brother to fall on his food, or sparing even a crumb for him. This was said not altogether in levity; and, in fact, I once asked Mahatma Gandhi to justify this feature of his faith to me. It will be strange, then, if to-day, when there are evidences of a missionary zeal in the activities of my Hindu brethren, I should resent their efforts in spreading their faith. More than that, if the Malkana Rajputs are in reality so unfamiliar with Islam as to be taken for Hindus, Muslims must thank Hindu missionaries for so forcibly reminding them of their own duty to look to the condition of millions of Muslims whose knowledge of Islam is as defective as their practice of its rites is slack.

Both communities must be free to preach as well as practise the tenets of their respective faiths. There are competing types of culture in the world, each instinct with the spirit of propagandism, and I hope we live in an age of conscious selection as between ideal systems. We cannot surely wish to practise that wasteful, and, at best. a precarious, elimination of "false doctrine" by actual destruction of those who hold it. I hope the age of the Spanish Inquisition has gone for ever, and no one would think of abolishing heresy by wiping out the heretic. Progress is now possible along the more direct and less painful path of conversion. But it must be the result of the exercise of the power of rational choice, and the man whose conversion we seek must be free to choose his faith. What true Muslim could be satisfied by the kind of "conversion" which some fanatical Moplahs are believed to have effected during the period of the Malabar troubles by forcibly depriving some Nairs of their tufts of hair

indicating their Hindu faith? No better in the sight of God is that outward conformity which is forced upon a person by bringing undue worldly pressure to bear upon him.

Allegations of such pressure by zamindars and moneylenders and by a numerical majority of neighbours in the surrounding area have been made and denied, and counter allegations have been made. This cannot but react unfavourably on national unity; and when over a very small matter the decision to put a stop to all demonstrative and inflammatory methods of mass conversion and reclamation was given up, the Hindu-Muslim Unity Committee at Delhi recommended to the Congress a resolution which was duly adopted, that a committee be formed to enquire into incidents connected with "Shuddhi" and "Anti-Shuddhi" movements, to visit places wherever coercion, intimidation, exercise of undue pressure or influence, or use of methods of proselytisation inconsistent with such a religious object is alleged or suspected, and to recommend such means as it thinks necessary for the prevention of such practices. Every political party in the West is, or, at least, pretends to be, jealous of its honour, and willingly consents to have a Corrupt Practices Act passed by the Legislature. We, who pride ourselves on our greater spirituality must be truly jealous of our reputations, and a national body like the Congress is a proper authority to advise all communities in this matter, if not to enforce a Corrupt Practices Act as part of the unwritten law of the nation. My own belief is that both sides are working with an eye much more on the next decennial Census than on heaven itself, and I frankly confess it is on such occasions that I sigh for the days when our forefathers settled things by cutting heads rather than counting them.

ABSORPTION OR CONVERSION

The quarrels about *alams* and *pipal* trees and musical processions are truly childish; but there is one question which can easily furnish a ground for complaint of unfriendly action if communal activities are not amicably adjusted. This is the ques-

tion of the conversion of the Suppressed Classes if Hindu society does not speedily absorb them. The Christian missionary is already busy and no one quarrels with him. But the moment some Muslim Missionary Society is organised for the same purpose there is every likelihood of an outcry in the Hindu Press. It has been suggested to me by an influential and wealthy gentleman who is able to organise a Missionary Society on a large scale for the conversion of the suppressed classes, that it should be possible to reach a settlement with leading Hindu gentlemen and divide the country into separate areas where Hindu and Muslim missionaries could respectively work, each community preparing for each year, or longer unit of time if necessary an estimate of the numbers it is prepared to absorb or convert. The estimates would of course be based on the number of workers and funds each had to spare, and tested by the actual figures of the previous period. In this way each community would be free to do the work of absorption and conversion, or rather of reform without chances of collision with one another. I cannot say in what light my Hindu brethren will take it, and I place this suggestion tentatively in all frankness and sincerity before them. All that I say for myself is that I have seen the condition of the *kali paraj* in the Baroda State and of the Gonds in the Central Provinces and I frankly confess it is a reproach to us all. If the Hindus will not absorb them into their own society, others will and must and then the orthodox Hindu too will cease to treat them as untouchables. Conversion seems to transmute them by a strong alchemy. But does this not place a premium upon conversion ?

THE DUTY OF THE PRESS

Once more the best and surest remedy is a change in the spirit of proselytisation ; but that cannot be expected of a Press so unrestrainedly partisan as we have to-day in parts of India. I am myself a journalist, and you all know that I have undergone some little suffering for the sake of securing the freedom of the Indian Press. At least, I can claim the honour, if honour it be,

to have figured in the leading case under the late lamentable Press Act, and it was I who started this fox even if I could not be at the kill. The removal of these external fetters makes it all the more necessary that we should exercise greater restraint than before over ourselves. But what I have seen of the Vernacular Press in the Punjab makes me apprehend that if it is not checked by the combined efforts of all Congressmen it will make us sigh for the resurrection of that dead and damned piece of bureaucratic legislation. Not that the bureaucracy would find much in our Punjab papers to which it would be inclined to apply the provisions of the Press Act even if it were resurrected, for in the estimation of the bureaucrat the offence punishable under section 153 A of the Indian Penal Code is not to be named in the same breath with that punishable under section 124-A of that Code. And even though the Press Act is no more, the Penal Code and the Civil Courts, where damages can be claimed by officials financed by the Government for alleged defamation, serve the Government well enough. But the nation remains wholly unprotected, and it is up to us not to leave it so exposed. It was I who strongly urged the Hindu-Muslim Unity Committee last September to recommend to the Congress a resolution on the subject of the Press. The Congress was asked to instruct its Working Committee to issue a manifesto inviting the attention of the Indian newspapers to the extreme necessity of exercising great restraint when dealing with matters likely to affect inter-communal relations, and also in reporting events and incidents relating to inter-communal dissensions and in commenting upon them. It was asked to appeal to them not to adopt an attitude which might prove detrimental to the best interests of India and which might embitter the relations between different communities. It was also recommended to the Congress that its Working Committee might be instructed to appoint in each province a small Committee which should request such newspapers as publish any matter likely to create inter-communal dissensions that they should desist from following such a course of action, and that if in spite of this friendly advice, no useful result were achieved these Committees should proclaim such newspapers. If even after this they did not alter their attitude, a boycott of them by Congressmen was to be declared in the last

resort. The Congress adopted this resolution also, but I fear its executive has not yet had time to carry out the instructions issued by the Congress. The most important work that we have to do, apart from this of restoring Hindu-Muslim unity, is to organise an adequate permanent establishment for the Congress and its Provincial and local Committees, for it is no use passing resolutions in the Congress which cannot be attended to by the honorary executive for lack of a paid, permanent establishment.

Friends, you may perhaps say I have taken up too much of your time in describing and detailing what the Congress did at Delhi and have hardly any proposals to place before you to-day. My answer is that you need few fresh proposals if you are determined to carry out those which you have already accepted. At Delhi we were able to proclaim to the world that we were not satisfied with the existing state of affairs and that we were resolved to remain united. That itself cleared the air to a great extent; but this was not all. We had provided remedies essentially sound in principle for our national ills; only we have not so far had time to use them. We spent perhaps too much time in examining, analysing and criticising the resolutions we had passed at Delhi, and a large section of Congressmen has been kept busy by the elections. Unless you adopt other measures to restore the national unity, it will be the duty of your executive to carry out the measures already adopted. But your executive will fail to accomplish anything of lasting value unless it has your ungrudging support and active assistance. In fact, you are your own most effective executive and as your servant specially nominated by you for the year that is now commencing I appeal to you to assist me in carrying out your own orders.

To the Indian Press I would address my most earnest appeal urging the Press to rise to the height of the occasion and not to disappoint the high expectations of one who is himself a journalist. When I was recently at Bijapur again and the first time visited its famous dome a friend who was as deeply impressed as myself by that wonderful pile, asked me in a whisper right across the dome if Europe with all its boast of superiority had a whispering gallery such as that of the *Gol Gumbad*. It is no doubt a

most astonishing experience to be able to hear distinctly across such a great space everything that is whispered, and the nine echoes heard in that gallery are equally remarkable. My friend was for the moment living the brilliant past of Bijapur over again and felt inordinate pride in the achievements of his Muslim ancestors. It was no doubt a great shock to him when I whispered back that the Whispering Gallery of Europe was even more marvellous. And then I told him that Europe's Whispering Gallery was the Press, its Fourth Estate! Every lie softly whispered in the privacy of the Editor-Proprietor's sanctum was shouted across all the continents, increasing in pitch and volume with every reverberation till it ended in the united shriek of hundreds of millions, leaving no chance for poor tongue-tied Truth to be heard! And yet it is just as easy to make the world resound with the thunder-peals of Truth as with the shrieks of Falsehood, and it is for the Indian Press to choose whether it will serve as the Whispering Gallery of Truth or of Falsehood.

SWARAJ AND FOREIGN AGGRESSION

Before I take final leave of the Hindu-Muslim question I wish to declare that if India wins Swaraj it will satisfy all the religious requirements of a Muslim in India. Swaraj, Sarv-Raj, or the Raj of all, implies Swadharma, and must imply that in an Eastern country. It is not therefore necessary that a Muslim should sit on the throne of the Mughals at Delhi, and we have all seen how the greatest Muslim State has ceased to have a Royal Throne and has converted itself into a Republic. Every true Muslim looks back with pride upon the thirty years of the Truly Guided Khalifas during which the Successors of the Prophet and the Commanders of the Faithful (with whom Allah was pleased) were the Chief Servants of the Commonwealth. Islam spread over the major portion of the civilised world and its empire extended over all the continents of the known world: but no Muslim holds dear the memory of Islam's later conquests and expansion as that of the first thirty years when it was the pride of the Muslim envoy to tell the envoys of the Byzantine and

Iranian empires who had been boasting of despotic power of their respective rulers that the Muslims had themselves appointed their ruler and would depose him just as readily if he acted against the Law of God. Victory has not been snatched from the jaws of defeat and despair by the valiant and God-fearing Turks to no purpose, and I feel confident that once they are free from the distractions inevitable after the victories both of war and peace they will revive with God's assistance the glories not of Omayyad or Abbasid Empire, but of the first thirty years of the Khilafat before there were any kings or dynasts.

I have my own views of the possible adjustment of the relations of all Muslim States and the Khalifa, but this is not the occasion to state them. It would suffice if I state here that Muslims can satisfy all their religious requirements no matter who is their secular sovereign so long as they recognise that "there is no governance but God's," and that "Him alone are we commanded to serve." As in every religion, there are in Islam certain things which every Muslim is required to do, and certain things which he is required not to do. Between these duties and prohibitions lies a vast stretch of ground in which he is free to roam about except for certain things which are in the nature of preferences. Now a Muslim can obey no creature of God who commands him to neglect one of these duties or to disregard one of these prohibitions, and it makes no difference whether that person is one of his own parents or his master or ruler, whether he is an enemy or a friend, or whether he is Muslim or a non-Muslim. So long as the temporal power of Islam is adequate and is always at the disposal of the Khalifa, it matters little whether a Muslim is a subject of a Muslim or of a non-Muslim. All he needs is the fullest freedom to obey none but God in the matter of his religious duties and prohibitions. Even if a Muslim sovereign, nay, even if the Khalifa himself, commanded him to disobey God, he must refuse; and it is obvious that he could not render unto a non-Muslim Cæsar what he could not render unto a Muslim Cæsar because it was due only to God. This being so, I cannot understand why there need be any question of a Muslim's unflinching loyalty to a Swaraj and Swadharma government.

THE TURK'S MESSAGE

The duty of the Muslims to-day is a double one. They owe a duty to themselves as Indians to secure freedom for themselves and for their posterity. India is no less their country than the Hindus', and even if the Hindus were to shrink from the sacrifices required in freedom's battle, though they will certainly never do so, it would still be their duty to persevere and to say that they would win Swaraj for all India even if they received no aid from the rest of India. But as Muslims too they are to secure Swaraj for their country. When I met the Turks in Paris, in Switzerland and in Rome they wondered how the same country that had despatched a large army, which included so considerable a proportion of Muslims, to fight against them could also send a delegation like ours to plead for better terms for them after their defeat. When I solved this riddle for them by explaining the paradox that many of the Muslim warriors that were not afraid of the Turkish sword or the German gun and could pass months and years in those death-traps called trenches, were yet afraid of the police man's truncheon and of police lock-ups and prison cell, my Turkish friends told me that in that case I must take the first boat back to India, and, instead of endeavouring to prevent their enslavement, I should go and break the fetters of my own countrymen. "We have beaten the English," they said, "on the soil of Turkey and in the Straits; but could not keep at bay for ever your Indian hordes that pressed us hard in Palestine and in Mesopotamia. Once you are free and no Indian Muslim can any longer be driven to fight against the forces of the Khalifa, both Turkey and Islam will be safe. It is your duty to us as well as to yourselves that you first win freedom in your own country." But they added, "let not your Hindu and Sikh fellow countrymen think that they owe a duty only to themselves and none to us. It is in order to keep them enslaved that Britain has forged such heavy chains for us."

AN EASTERN FEDERATION

Friends, I am glad to hear that so many of my Hindu fellow-

workers are thinking of establishing a relatnionship with other Eastern countries. Their political ideas have scaled the ramparts of the Himalayas and crossed the moat of the surrounding seas. They recognise that the freedom of every Asiatic nation helps their own freedom, and they contemplate the organisation of an Eastern Federation. The first step had already been taken by Mahatma Gandhi when at Amritsar he identified himself with the cause of the Khilafat. It would be a strange thing if while the Hindus set about organising an Eastern Federation, Indian Muslims should cease to co-operate with them all because one newspaper correspondent realised in the sufferings of the Muslims at Saharanpur the tragic scenes enacted at Smyrna. Nothing could be more foolish and more absurd than this, and if the Turks ever came to hear of this comparison they would not feel an excess of gratitude for us.

A FINAL QUESTION TO THE MUSLIMS

But one question and one only I shall ask those who point to the episode of Saharanpur—where no doubt it is the Hindus that have suffered most—as sufficient reason to veer round from non-co-operation to co-operation. And that question is this. Was there no British Government ruling in India when Muslims had to undergo such unmerited sufferings? Was a Hindu administrating the district or even a non-co-operating Muslim? Finally, was not the department of justice administered by a Muslim who had broken away from the community of which he used to be a great leader at one time and had co-operated with the foreign Government? These are not three separate questions, but one, *viz.*, if neither the Government nor those Muslims who co-operate with it were able to save the Muslims of Saharanpur, what prospect is there of any greater safety for them if these conditions are perpetuated by our co-operation? I pause for an answer, but I fear I shall not get it.

In the meantime, the Holy Land of Islam remains in the custody of non-Muslim mandatories. Five times a day every Muslim who offers his daily prayers with regularity turns his face

towards the Ka'ba. While I was still in the Bijapur gaol a question occurred to me which I put into verse, and it still remains unanswered :

اس کا کعبہ جسکی جانب روز پڑھتے تھے نماز
کیا کہینگے اس سے کیونکر قبضہ دشمن میں تھا

(His Ka'ba facing which we were daily offering prayers, what shall we say to Him how it was left under the enemy's control ?)

THE BLOW RECALLED AFTER THE FIGHT

Friends, I have said all that I could say on the Hindu-Muslim question and if after all this lengthy dissertation I leave any Hindu or Muslim still unconvinced of the necessity of co-operation among ourselves and non-co-operation with our foreign masters, I can say no more and must acknowledge myself beaten. One thing is certain, and it is this that neither can the Hindus exterminate the Muslims to-day nor can the Muslims get rid of the Hindus. If the Hindus entertain any such designs they must know that they lost their opportunity when Mohammad bin Qasim landed on the soil of Sind twelve hundred years ago. Then the Muslims were few, and to-day they number more than seventy millions. And if the Muslims entertain similar notions, they too have lost their opportunity. They should have wiped out the whole breed of Hindus when they ruled from Kashmir to Cape Comorin and from Karachi to Chittagong. And as the Persian proverb says, the blow that is recalled after the fight must be struck on one's own jaw. If they cannot get rid of one another, the only thing to do is to settle down to co-operate with one another, and while the Muslims must remove all doubts from the Hindu minds about their desire for Swaraj for its own sake and their readiness to resist all foreign aggression, the Hindus must similarly remove from the Muslim minds all apprehensions that the Hindu majority is synonymous with Muslim servitude. As for myself, I am willing to exchange my present servitude for another in which my Hindu fellow-countryman would be the slave-

driver instead of the foreign master of my destiny, for by this exchange I would at least prevent the enslavement of 250 million of my co-religionists whose slavery is only another name for the continued existence of European Imperialism. When at Lucknow in 1916 some Hindus complained to my late chief, Bal Gangadhar Tilak Maharaj, that they were giving too much to the Muslims he answered back like a true far-seeing statesman: "You can never give the Muslims too much." To-day when I hear complaints that we are showing great weakness in harping on Hindu-Muslim unity when the Hindus show no desire to unite, I say, "You can never show too great weakness in your dealings with Hindus." Remember, it is only the weak who fear to appear too weak to others. With this observation I take my last leave of this question without a proper and a lasting settlement of which we can effect nothing.

BENGAL UNLAW CRIMINAL AMENDMENT BILL

Written under a pen-name in the *Comrade*, 7th November, 1924. As a columnist Mohamed Ali takes 'as large a charter as the wind to blow' on whom he pleases!

VII

BENGAL UNLAW CRIMINAL AMENDMENT BILL

IMITATING Rip Van Winkle, I have just awakened from dog-sleep of ten years, and having found previously taken oath of allegiance as Honorary Member of Council too brittle, at least in war-time, when everything, from Rheims Cathedral down to Allied pledges, had had to be broken, I contemplate taking another oath, unless Reparation Commission or Dawes Plan can repair the old one.

Having awakened at long last, I went to imperial legislature, now dubbed "Assembly," but Delhi's doors were still closed, and Simla had ended its work with the Silly Season. But to my rescue came Lytton, provincial gubernator of Bengal, though bearer of distinguished name associated with Imperial Assemblage and redolent with the fragrance of the flowery paths of poesy which a Viceroy half a century ago trod in preference to Temple alleys and Threadneedle Street. Yes, Lytton, hearing that the sleeper had awakened, and expecting his return to his old legislative haunts, has sent for perusal and study, as prospective M.L.C. Draft Bill he is about to present to Bengal Council minus its Ministers. Being too democratic, I cannot think of giving, like Basantbai, unstinted support to Sircar without first consulting millions of constituents, and so I publish the Draft Bill for opinion. Hope comments will be brief and couched in polite, printable language. The Bill must on no account be damned with faint praise or without it. Here is the Draft:

DRAFT OF BENGAL UNLAW CRIMINAL AMENDMENT BILL

Whereas it is common knowledge that the non-co-operators

are the enemies of unlaw and disorder, and the Swarajists while doing only lip-service to constructive programme of the Mahatma, have vowed to destroy O'Dwyerarchy, Dyerarchy, and Dyarchy by occupying the Seats of the Mighty in Assembly and Council and whereas *Ministers* have been dismissed by representatives of the people of Bengal as unceremoniously as Sahebs dismiss bearers, Khansamas and Khitmatgars and Mem Sahebs dismiss ayas, and in consequence thereof the problem of unemployment has become as acute here as in England under a Labour Government and whereas periodical increases in emoluments of Indian Civil Servants, who are neither Indian, nor civil, nor servants, have been turned down by Assembly for the wholly unsound reason that India is the poorest country, and the said Indian Civil Servants, or the reverse thereof, are the highest paid in the world, and consequently sound and permanent political progress cannot be accelerated except by accelerating the progressive increase of their emoluments and retarding the progressive decrease of their powers and privileges, and whereas all other means for dealing with non-co-operators have been exhausted except good Government, which is no substitute for resolute Government, and whereas it is expedient, even though it is far from being moral or legal to amend the Bengal Criminal Unlaw Act, now therefore it is hereby enacted as follows :

1. This Act may or may not be called the Bengal Unlaw Criminal Amendment Act 1929. In case no Indian legislature passes it in the twenties, this Draft Bill may be read as providing another blank for the tens as well like the blank already provided for the units. If, however, in the year 1929, provided by unchanging Fate itself for all constitutional changes no changes occurs, whether for better or for worse, and existing legislature continue to make, unmake or refuse to make laws, this section must be read as if it provided blanks for the hundreds and the thousands as well. The Bill will then become law in due course in Greek Calendar.

2. It extends to the whole of Bengal, and for purposes of this Act, but for no other purpose, it shall be a criminal offence to partition Bengal even if a Superior Curzon were to become

the Golden White Moghul in Charles Street and to seek once more the "vivisection of Bengal."

3. In this Act, even if there is anything repugnant in the subject or context, "the Code" means the Code of Criminal Procedure and of every form, sort, kind or variety of uncivil procedure, and in fact every Code except the Code of Honour and the Code of Ethics.

4. (*i*) The Local Government or General Misgovernment may, will, shall and must by order in writing, or by visible representation, or palpable misrepresentation, or by word of month or dumb show, or by mere feeling or volition, or by any other psychological or psychic process, direct or misdirect that any person, animal or thing, whether born, dead or yet to be born, or, like Ministerialist members wholly inanimate, accused of any offence, specified or unspecified, in the first or any other schedule, or of defence set up in court or council, in the press or on the public platform, shall be tried by Commissioners, Collectors, Deputy Collectors, Tahsildars, Mamlatdars, Naib-Tahsildars, Awwal Karkuns, Qanungoes, Patwaries, Talaties, Kulkarnies, Karnams, Kanakapillais, or other officials or non-officials not above the rank of toadies and tuft-hunters or sycophants and slaves, appointed under this Act and disappointed by other acts, to wit, the refusal of the Assembly to increase their emoluments, the dismissal of Ministers by the Council and non-appearance of their names when grade promotions and the Honours Lists are gazetted.

(*ii*) An order under Sub-section (*i*) may be made in respect of any person, animal, thing and Indians *hoc genus omne* for any offence or defence as specified in Sub-section (*i*). Whether such offence was committed, or such defence was set up, before or after the commencement of this Act, and in any year, whether A.D. or B.C. and whether before or after Genesis.

4. (*a*) Commissioners, Collectors, Deputy Collectors, in fact, the whole string down to Karnams and Kanakapillais, may be appointed for the whole of Bengal or any fraction thereof, decimal, vulgar or noble, or any part thereof lopped off, torn, wrenched, partitioned or Curzonified and still un-Hardinged.

(*b*) All trials under this Act shall be held by three Commissioners, Collectors, etc., as before, at least two of whom shall be persons who are serving and have from time immemorial served the interests of injustice, and the third shall be a person who is serving and has served for a similar period no interest except his own.

5. (*i*) Commissioners, Collectors, etc., as before, appointed and disappointed, also as before, may, will, shall and must take cognisance of offences and defences specified or unspecified, as before, (Allah be praised for "as before"—compositor, Comrade Press) and shall follow any procedure prescribed by any Code, and shall be bound not to adjourn any trial for any purpose save that of injustice, and death shall not entitle the accused or his heirs, successors, executors, administrators, assignees or next of kin to have the trial adjourned for his funeral, or for any other reason, including Doomsday.

(*ii*) In the event of any difference of opinion among the Commissioners *et cetera* the opinion of the trying official or non-official ordering immediate execution of the accused whether before or after trial, shall prevail, and the other officials or non-officials shall be deemed to be guilty of the same fate as the accused.

6. The Commissioners, etc., may pass upon any person convicted or not convicted by them any sentence, authorised or unauthorised by law, including such inducements to make a confession of heresy, *Probatio probatissim* or *vox vera* as were offered by the Holy Office of the Inquisition, and other tortura, tormenta and quaestiones such as "languishing fire," "burning pincers," "The wheel," *Piene forte et dure, the equulens* or the Rack, "*the Plumbatae or*" Leaden balls, "the *ungulae*" or "barbed hooks," the lamina or "hot plate," the *fidiculae* or "cord compressing the arm," the "Scavenger's Daughter" that compress the victim into a ball, the "iron gauntlets" or "bilboes," the *fungfernkuss*, the puntale or "friquent," the canape or "hempen cord" the water and cord, the strappado or "fulley" the "hot brick," the tablillos or "thumb-screw and boots combined," the *mala mansio*, the cell called "hittle Ease" and the "Cave of Roses" which was replete

with reptiles.

7. The provisions of the Code, so far only as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of, or the special procedure prescribed by or under this Act, and only so far as they are inconsistent with all other laws, human or divine, Shariat, Shastric, or Cannon law, shall apply to the proceedings of the Commissioners, etc.

8. Commissioners, etc., trying an offence, or no offence, under this Act, may, with a view to obtaining the evidence of any person believed, thought, conceived, supposed, imagined, fancied, or entirely disbelieved to have been, to be, or about to be, or never to be directly or indirectly concerned in, or privy to the offence, or wholly unconcerned therein tender a pardon to such person, on condition of his making a full detailed, incriminating and wholly untrue, disclosure of the whole circumstances, within or without his knowledge, relating to the offence, and to every other person, concerned or unconcerned, whether as principal or abettor in the commission thereof, or his ascendant or descendant to the seventh generation, or a collateral seventeen degrees removed from him.

2. It shall be open to the Commissioners, etc., in lieu of tendering pardon as aforesaid, to have the title of Khan Bahadur, Rai Bahadur, Rao Bahadur or Diwan Bahadur conferred on such person when the next Honours list is published, provided that it shall be lawful to cancel and withdraw the honour thus conferred should it be proved to the satisfaction of the said commissioners, etc., that any particle of truth has strayed into the statement of such persons.

9. (*i*) Any person convicted or acquitted on a trial held by Commissioners, etc., under this Act may appeal to the High Court, with a view to have his sentence enhanced or have a sentence passed on him, as the case may be, and such appeal shall be disposed of by the said court in the manner in which appeals made against judgment in favour of the executive are disposed of.

(*ii*) When the Commissioners, etc., pass sentence of death, and it has been duly executed, the proceedings shall be submit-

ted to the High Court, and the sentence shall not be executed again unless it is confirmed by the said court.

10. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Indian Evidence Act, I of 1872, when the statement of any person has been fabricated, cooked or concocted by any member of the police force, and recorded by any magistrate such statement may be admitted in evidence in trial before the said commissioners, etc., if such person has been killed, hidden away or made incapable of giving evidence, and the said commissioners are of opinion that such death, disappearance or incapacity has been caused in the interest of justice by officials or non-officials duly appointed for this purpose.

11. The Local Government may, by notification in the local official Gazette, or without any such notification, make or mar rules consistent or inconsistent with this Act, to provide for all, or any or none of the matters that may conceivably or inconceivably arise.

12. Where, in the opinion of the Local Government there are reasonable or unreasonable grounds, or none at all, for believing, imagining, fancying or disbelieving that any person (*i*) has acted, is acting, is about to act, or is capable of acting in contravention of any act, law, ordinance, regulation, rule, order, or unexpressed wish of Government, or (*ii*) has committed, is committing, is about to commit or is capable, of committing, any offence, specified or unspecified in the second schedule, or (*iii*) has used, is using, is about to use or is capable of using force or violence, or threat of force or violence, in act, word or deed, as laid down in the Ahmedabad pledge, or (*iv*) has not condemned, is not condemning, is not about to condemn, or is not capable of condemning, anything done or intended to be done, or omitted or intended to be omitted by the late Gopi Nath Saha, the Local Government if it is satisfied that such a person is a member of any association, club, society, family, caste, tribe, profession, mercantile company, or trade guild which Government has declared or may declare to be wanting in love or affection for Government, so that it becomes thereby guilty of disaffection and of enmity, ill-will and all other forms of hostility towards Government, may

order that such person (*a*) shall notify where he stands, sits or lies, and shall notify any and every change of posture to every authority that may exist in the land; (*b*) shall report himself to the police every three seconds without interfering with the nightly slumber or the daily siesta of any policeman, which may last twenty-four hours everyday; (*c*) shall conduct himself in such manner as may be so specified, including standing on his head and playing golf in that position, taking a dive in the Diamond Harbour and not appearing again on the surface for twelve consecutive hours, and walking five hours on the railway track of the E.I.R., at a pace not exceeding one mile per hour, while a mail train is in motion a hundred yeards behind him travelling in the same direction at the speed of one mile per minute; (*d*) shall abstain from such acts as may be so specified, including sleeping, eating, drinking and breathing; (*e*) shall reside or remain in any place so specified, including the bed of the Hoogli or the bottom of a well; (*f*) shall not enter, reside or remain in any area where there is air, earth or sky; (*g*) shall be committed to custody of any person, including the Angel of Death; provided that the Local Government shall not in any order under clause (*e*) specify an area outside the territorial jurisdiction of God without the previous sanction of the Governor-General in Council. (1) The Local Government in its order under sub-section (*i*) may direct (*a*) the arrest without rhyme or reason, of the person in respect of whom the order is made wherever he may or may not be found by any policeman, or other officer or non-official who may care to earn promotion or title; and (*b*) the search of any place in this or in the other world.

13. An order under sub-section (*i*) of section 12 shall be served on the person in respect of whom it is made in the usual manner provided for service of Government orders including a slap and a kick; but in the case of a first offender it may be served only with severe words and other expressions suggesting that the genealogy of the person on whom it is served goes back to some animal not particulary intelligent or clean.

14. (*i*) An officer of Government desiring promotion, and any non-official coveting any honour may arrest with or without

section (*i*) of Section 12 a decennial allowance for his support of such amount calculated to the seventh decimal place of a pie, which in the opinion of the Local Government is a proper dying wage, which shall be paid at the end of the decennium or after death whichever is the longer period.

21. With a view to the performance of the fundamental duty of the Government, on which political advance and all the functions of a civilized social organism depend, this Act shall be deemed to indemnify in advance all persons for whatsoever they have done to any person believed, thought, conceived, suspected, imagined or fancied to be a non-co-operator or a Swarajist, and no suit, prosecution or other legal proceedings shall lie against any person for anything which is done in good faith or in bad, or intended to be done under this Act.

THE CHALLENGE TO OUR LOVE OF FREEDOM

A leader written on Mahatma Gandhi's Presidential Address to the Indian National Congress at Belgaum in January, 1925.

VIII

THE CHALLENGE TO OUR LOVE OF FREEDOM

WE have read Mahatma Gandhi's Presidential Address more than once, not because there is anything startlingly new in it, or anything that was not clear enough on the very first reading. He has only one message for the nation, and that he gave when he called upon it to non-co-operate with this alien Government. Far from enlarging that message, he has, in fact, shortened it, because while consenting to, or rather recognising the fact of, the suspension of other items of Non-Co-operation as part of the national programme, he now calls upon the nation to concentrate on Hindu-Muslim unity, the removal of Untouchability and the production and use of Khaddar for the emancipation of India. We have read his Presidential Address more than once because after the first reading it failed to grip us. Like the athlete who would not permit an ounce of fat to encumber him without giving him additional strength, Mahatma Gandhi does not tolerate unnecessary rhetoric. He is to that extent an ascetic in his writing, just as he is to a great extent an ascetic in the matter of food and clothing, and in fact in his entire way of living. In writing his address he has practised this asceticism even more rigorously than is habitual with him, and over and above his usual economy of words there is apparent a deliberate restraint as regards the use of sentiment. But his address improves on acquaintance, and we would ask our readers to read it over and over again until it soaks into them and they realise what it is that the Mahatma means to convey to them.

Without using words suggestive of an ultimatum, he still presents to-day an ultimatum to the nation. We know how distressed the Mahatma was when the Associated Press converted his "helplessness," on hearing the details of the Kohat Tragedy, which induced him to undertake his hazardous fast of twenty-one

days, into "hopelessness." He is the last man to lose hope, and nothing suggestive of despair would be a fitting title for the address he is delivering to-day at Belgaum ; otherwise we would have called it "A Forlorn Hope." But if it is not that, it is emphatically his challenge to our much-vaunted love of freedom. And if there is any Indian who claims that he has a true sense of his present slavery and hates his chains, then we are convinced he can have no alternative but to take up this challenge, and to prove by the end of the year 1925, through his work on the lines recommended by Mahatma Gandhi, that we loved freedom like righteousness and hated slavery like iniquity.

JUSTIFICATION OF NON-CO-OPERATION

Mahatma Gandhi cannot offer a better justification of Non-Co-operation, which so many people foolishly think he is giving up, than by stating at the very outset of his address that "from the September of 1920 the Congress has been principally an institution for developing strength from within." It has certainly ceased to function by means of resolutions addressed to the Government for redress of grievances. These resolutions were nothing more than the petitions dictated by our weakness, unless, of course, we did not know that the real character of the existing system of Government was not beneficial. The party or parties in India that ask us to confine our activities to so-called constitutionalism, have no justification for such a slogan but that of a belief in the beneficial character of the present system. If they still believe in that, they are fully justified in passing resolutions for the redress of their grievances, and in expecting results from such a barren procedure. But Liberals like Mr. Shastri and Mr. Chintamani do not seem to believe in that beneficial character any more than Mahatma Gandhi or we ourselves. That is why we cannot understand their self denying ordinance which confines their activities to the narrow circle of a Constitution which they did not frame, and which they cannot alter, but which their political opponents as well as ours have deliberately devised, and which they mean to maintain in all its narrowness as long as they

can do it. The Swarajists do not swear by the Constitution that has been imposed upon them from the outside; but then claim that they will take advantage of such opportunities as even this Constitution offers, of compelling the Government to come to terms with them and agree to make such a radical modification of it as would give us Swaraj. The only excuse that we can plead for them is that of self-deception. We maintain that the Government may be vexed by their obstructionist tactics, but it cannot be brought to its knees unless, in the words of Mahatma Gandhi, the nation develops strength from within. This it will not do by their sparring in the Councils with officials and with the latter's non-official supporters. The whole problem before the country is to devise means for the development of national strength from within, and the Mahatma's conclusion is that if there is any alternative to the use of the knife and the revolver and the bomb, it is Charkha, which alone makes it possible for us to boycott foreign cloth that impoverishes us, and, of course, the other boycotts the suspension of which by the nation the Mahatma has been forced to recognise. The Mahatma's message for 1925, then, is the message of the Charkha, and we beseech all India to understand its implications.

NON-VIOLENCE

As all the world knows, and as even his opponents acknowledge, non-violence is the essential principle of Mahatma Gandhi's life and teachings; and he has always taught his countrymen that, even if they are not convinced that non-violence is the only proper creed, they should at least give up all thought of violence for political purposes and adopt non-violence as their policy. We are among those that believe war to be a great evil; but we also believe that there are worse things than war, and that a nation's slavery is one of them. Ordinarily war must not be resorted to by ourselves; but when it is forced upon us by an enemy that believes in no other argument than that of force, we believe that we must not shrink from war, but must defend ourselves against him and use all the force we can command, force without

stint and without cessation, till, in the language of the Quran, "war hath dropped her weapons" and peace and persuasion resume their sway over men's minds. We, however, entirely agree with Mahatma Ghandhi that non-violence is the only proper policy for India to adopt to-day for her emancipation. We *can* achieve victory without violence. More than that, the use of violence for a nation of 320 million people should be a matter of reproach to it. Finally, victory achieved with violence cannot but be the victory of the fighting classes. Swaraj, to be the *raj* of all, must have been won through the willing sacrifice of all. If this is not so, we shall have to depend for its maintenance as well on the prowess of the fighting classes, which we must not do. Swaraj must be won by the minimum sacrifice of the maximum number, and not by the maximum sacrifice of the minimum number. And, since we believe that the Charkha requires the minimum sacrifice of the maximum number, while the sword requires the maximum sacrifice of the minimum number, we have agreed that the nation should keep its sword, such as it is, sheathed, but must work its Charkha for all it is worth. Knowing the possibilities of the Charkha we do not hanker after violence, and this is our final answer to those who always love to misrepresent others when it serves their purpose. Now Mahatma Gandhi's standard of non-violence, to which he required all national volunteers at Ahmedabad in 1921 to pledge themselves, is a very high one; for he requires Indians to be non-violent not only in deed, but also in word, and even in thought and intent. According to this standard, only too many of his countrymen have failed during the last three years; but it is the success that he has achieved in his preaching which surprises us more than the violence of which we have had some exhibition. When the guilt of Chauri-Chaura and similar unfortunate occurrences is judged, it is necessary to take into consideration not only that which was done, but also that which had been resisted. Never before in the annals of India have the people felt as intensely as they have done since the dawn of Non-Co-operation, and the marvel is not that the fury of the mob has resulted in so much bloodshed, but that the manhood of India has been successfully revived with so little of it. We challenge any one to show another instance in the

history of mankind where hundreds of millions of people have been roused to stand up for their liberties, and have remained so peaceful as the people of India. There is no country in Europe with all its cold, frog blood that would not have experienced a deluge of blood in like circumstances. That India has escaped such a deluge is due to Mahatma Gandhi and to his fellow-workers.

The Mahatma embarrasses his followers and fellow-workers only too often with his sweeping and unqualified admissions. We are, however, glad that in his address he acknowledges that the propaganda of non-violence checked the outbreak of physical violence which would certainly have broken out had Non-violent Non-Co-operation not come into being. He is perhaps too hard when he says that the most important boycott demanded by the Non-Co-operation, namely, the boycott of violence, though it appeared to be at one time entirely successful, was non-violence that was only skin deep. It was certainly more than that; and although it was to a great extent passive and born of helplessness. it was nevertheless genuine and effective as far as it went. And we disagree with him when he says that it was due to Non-Co-operation that there was an eruption of intolerance against those who did not cease to co-operate. Elsewhere he has said that Hindu-Muslim riots are the result of the imperfect Non-Co-operation of his followers. To use the truth rather seems to be that the people were in earnest, and had not acquired enough self-control to keep their intolerance of Non-Co-operators always in check. As regards Hindu-Muslim riots, we doubt if any of his followers have participated in them. It is true that some of those whose wranglings in the newspapers have been really at the bottom of many of these unfortunate occurrences still claim to be his followers; but these have only countenanced violence indirectly. They have not directly participated in it themselves.

In any case, what is necessary is that we should rigidly practise non-violence and set a better example to the masses than we have yet done. Our war even against the existing system, of government must be a war without an enemy, and we should certainly practise far more tolerance towards each other, whether

those opposed to us are No-Changers or Swarajists, and whether they are Hindus or Muslims. But we deprecate the fashion that there seems to be in some No-Changer circles of suggesting that the Swarajists are any more in love with violence than the No-Changers themselves. Nor do we believe that there is likely to be any extraordinary recrudescence of violence in India for political purposes. Our imperfect Non-Co-operation not having brought us Swaraj, the impatient who had resorted to violence before but had given it up on the commencement of Non-violent Non-Co-operation, may naturally be inclined to resort to violence once more, though we can expect no better results from such violence today than were obtained in the past. Violence requires courage, however much we may characterise crimes of violence as cowardly, and there is no evidence of any great access of courage to-day among Indians to warrant us to expect greater resort to violence on the part of the politically-minded people in India. The fact is that at Bardoli the Mahatma asked us to drop violence; but fear even of the consequences of Non-violent Non-Co-operation and its discomforts and inconveniences made up drop Non-Co-operation instead. This is our own reading of the situation as distinct from the Mahatma's; nevertheless we do think that the resentment which is certain to be generated by otherwise unroductive and sterile debates in the legislatures will not help us in the creation of that atmosphere which we need for the universalisation of the Charkha. And if the Swarajists do not give up Council-work, which we certainly do not expect them to do at this stage, it is all the more necessary for them to emphasise that they think that violence will only retard progress and not accelerate it. We do not, however, wish to preach perfection to them; and in the matter of non-violence we do not consider their leaders like Messrs. Nehru and Dass stand in need of any No-Changer's advice. But we would ask their Marathi-speaking confreres, whose unwillingness to spin is well known, to consider most carefully the proposition that the Charkha is the only possible substitute for the knife and the revolver and the bomb. We can understand if they think that by opposing the bureaucracy in the Councils, and forcing it to come out into the open as force naked and unashamed, they will produce enough excitement in the

country to increase the forces of violence and give the believers in violence a better chance. But if, like us, they have given up all thought of India's emancipation throught violence and they also think that at any rate in her present state such enterprises are doomed to failure and would only retard our progress, then they must consider what good their Council wranglings are expected to do, and how they can thereby develop the nation's strength from within.

THE CHARKHA

In our issue of the 28th November we have discussed at sufficient length the economic drain due to the use of foreign cloth, and the improvement of our peasantry, the life of which, since there is no *Charkha* now in the peasant's cottage, is a long-drawn question between a crop and a crop. We have shown how on that peasantry, in the last resort, not only we, but the Swarajists also, rely; and we hope we have proved that the only cure for its economic debility is its employment in the slack season of agriculture in the production of khaddar. As foreign cloth is by far our largest import, and as most of it comes from Great Britain herself, the production of khaddar by our peasantry will not only cure its own economic debility, but will also restore the economic equilibrium of the country at large, and will at the same time affect the nation that is keeping us in such slavish subjection to itself. What other weapon, we ask, can do all these things at one and the same time? But the peasantry is most unlikely to take to the Charkha once more in large enough numbers after all these years, unless it is assured by the patronage of the classes of ready sale for its produce, and unless we advertise this cure of its debility by taking a little of it ourselves. If we had Swaraj already, and could shut out foreign cloth by means of the tariff, which is an exercise of economic compulsion, we could assure the khaddar producers in the cottages that a good market exised for their wares; but even then we doubt if we could induce the cottager to produce khaddar and have the supply ready by artificially creating for it a demand in the

country. In any case, we have not yet got Swaraj, and khaddar we are discussing just at present as a means to the attainment of that end, and not as an end in itself. We are, therefore, reduced to the single alternative of the classes spinning in order to induce the masses to produce khaddar.

Figures have often been published to prove two things. One of them is that the mills by themselves cannot shut out all foreign cloth, even if they can help us—which obviously they cannot—in distributing wealth among the peasants, and thus curing their economic debility. The next thing that these figures go to prove is that khaddar together with mill-cloth will suffice to close the door of India on foreign Cloth. Obviously then we cannot do without the production of khaddar, and without the spinning of the classes as an inducement to the masses to produce it. The Mahatma's acceptance of the Presidentship of the Congress and his exposition in his address of what he desires and hopes is, therefore, nothing short of what we have called it—a challenge to every Indian's claim that he loves his country and the freedom of his country.

He deals sufficiently and exhaustively, though as usual extremely briefly, with the objections of the critics, and it is not necessary to repeat what he has said. To his observation with regard to the criticism that the spinning-wheel is not exciting enough, "for the millions solid work itself is an excitement and tonic at the same time," we would only add that things even duller and more insipid than the Charkha would be more exciting than the strongest of strong drinks to one who only understood that they provided the one chance of freedom that remained for him and his nation of 320 millions ! We ask if there is one lover of excitement in India, be he gambler, be he imbiber of spirituous liquors, whom the biggest stakes and the fieriest potions now fail to excite, who will not find the new excitement he needs for his jaded being in a thing that has some chance, where none other exists, of breaking the chains of a nation that constitutes a fifth of the whole of humanity ?

We believe the Charkha has this chance, and we want the whole of India to become Charkha-mad during the year of the

Mahatma's Presidentship. And if those of the Swarajists who are not unwilling to spin can help us, while doing their own Council-work undisturbed, to spread the infection of Charkha-madness all over the country, then we think the agreement which the Mahatma has signed at Calcutta, and for the acceptance of which he pleads in his address, will be amply justified. But if a party proud of its discipline just secures from a majority of its members who are unwilling to spin twenty-four thousand yards each of handspun yarn purchased from the bazaar, to enable them to take part in the Congress voting, even if a minority of its members contributes yarn of its own spinning, then, we fear, the document signed at Calcutta would be a scrap of paper of less value than the paper itself. But even in that case we shall ourselves remain Charkha-mad, and we want to urge every No-Changer to go on as if the Swarajists did not exist, and to try to infect the whole of the country with his own Charkha-madness. He must go in blinkers, entirely disregarding what the Swarajists are doing and what they are not doing, only looking ahead at the goal, which must be to make by the end of his Chief's term of office the boycott of foreign cloth very nearly, if not entirely, complete. It will not do for him to tarry any longer by the roadside, waiting for fellow-workers unwilling to continue the journey, or wasting his time in idle reproaches. He must be a fanatic, for whom at least there is no limited liability ; and without permitting the least partisanship or malice to cross his path, he must co-operate with all other fanatics equally Charkha-mad to assist Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress in the execution of the national programme outlined at Belgaum. No one could then have any quarrel with a Society of "Fanatics Unlimited" such as we have suggested ; and yet it would be the spearhead of the Congress for pushing through with its main purpose. There is little indication in the Mahatma's address of such madness as we desire to produce ; but in the rigid restraint he has exercised over himself in the language of his address, to which we have already alluded, and in the character of the agreement itself into which he entered at Calcutta there is sufficient indication to us and to many others who know him of the fires that are melting the lava under the crust of the rigid and cold earth. If there was any

doubt on the subject, it must have been cleared the other day when the Mahatma gave ample opportunity to all sceptics among No-Changers to express and to resolve their doubts, and ended up with warning those who pledged themselves to work his Charkha programme, that he was a relentless and inexorable leader who could spare no pity for those who would, while on the march, fall out of the ranks, footsore and weary and disinclined to proceed any further.

We ask our readers to consider carefully what it is that the Mahatma is proposing. He is that rare being, a visionary, who is at the same time a thoroughly practical person, the most large-hearted man in the world to-day, and one who is also among the topmost men of the world in intellectual greatness. He deliberately tells three hundred and twenty millions of his countrymen that their one chance of freedom is the fullest possible use of the Charkha by all classes of Indians; and the highest political body in the country has deliberately and with eyes open imposed upon him the burden of leading it at this critical juncture. Can any sane man think anything else but that those who have imposed this burden upon him mean to offer him their fullest and most steadfast support? He frankly tells everyone that if the Charkha does not appeal to his head as well as to his heart, he will be wanting in his duty in not rejecting his lead. He tells his people that they would be justified in regarding him as a hindrance to national progress if they consider him to be wrong in his exposition of the doctrine underlying the spinning wheel. What, we ask, must the world think of people that do not reject his lead after this, but act as if they accepted it, and yet fail to be infected with his own madness, and to attempt to infect others therewith? We are a nation of slaves, and we have proved ourselves to be a nation of cowards also. This only is required to prove us to be a nation of humbugs as well! This is the implication of the Mahatma's presidential address, which we have characterised as a challenge to our partiotism and to our love of freedom.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

The only item of the original programme of Non-Co-operation that Mahatma Gandhi proposes to retain is, as we have seen, the boycott of foreign cloth; for which the universalisation of the Charkha is the only means. But he cannot give battle to the enemy even in his own peaceful fashion if the national army is not itself united. What general would lead an army the soldiers of which were making targets of each other? Mahatma Gandhi is perfectly right when he says that some Hindus and some Muslims prefer the present condition of dependence on Great Britain if they cannot have either wholly Hindu or wholly Muslim India. We claim to know enough of Islam to be able to say that it does not require a Muslim to impose the rule of a Muslim sovereign upon non-Muslim subjects, and it does not require him to subvert the rule of a non-Muslim sovereign over Muslim subjects so long as he is free to follow the commandments of his God. Islam is a theocracy, and in the language of the Quran "there is no government but God's," and "Him alone are we commanded to serve." As in every religion so also in Islam there are certain things which every Muslim is required to do, and certain things which he is required not to do. Between these duties and prohibitions lies a vast stretch of ground in which he is free to roam about. except for certain things which are in the nature of preferences. Now a Muslim can obey no creature of God who commands him to neglect these duties or to disregard these prohibitions, and it makes no difference whether that person is one of his own parents, or his master or ruler, whether he is an enemy or a friend, or whether he is a Muslim of a non-Muslim. So long as the temporal power of Islam is adequate for the defence of a Muslim's religious liberty, and is always at the disposal of the Khalifa, it matters little whether a Muslim is a subject of a Muslim or of a non-Muslim. All he needs is the fullest freedom to obey none but God in the matter of his religious duties and prohibitions. Even if a Muslim sovereign—nay, even if the Khalifa himself commanded him to disobey God, he must refuse; and it is obvious that he could not render unto a non-Muslim Cæsar what he could not render unto a Muslim Cæsar, because it

was due only to God. This being so, we cannot understand why there need be any question of a Muslim's unflinching loyalty to a Swaraj Government that guaranteed *swadharma*. It is only when in the name of Swaraj any obligations are sought to be imposed upon a Muslim which he cannot fulfil without disregarding the obligations imposed upon him by God's government, that he must refuse and rebel. But the same refusal and rebellion would become a religious obligation if it has not a Swaraj Government in India, but the Government of the Great Mughal re-established in Delhi, or that of the Khalifa himself as it used to be in Turkey before the deposition of Mohammed Waheeduddin, that sought to impose upon him such obligations. God's government is not necessarily incompatible with Hindu or Christian sovereignty; and yet it may be incompatible with the rule of a Muslim who demands obedience to the commands of a creature of God in preference to the commandments of the Creator Himself. With this important reservation, a Muslim can be loyal to any Government, be the ruler Muslim or non-Muslim. But if there is any meaning in religion, this reservation is common to all religions. It makes all the difference in the world which you place first, God or man. Those who call upon Muslims to relegate God to a secondary position ask him to surrender his faith, and to this no Muslim can consent. But to such a surrender no Hindu or Sikh or Parsi, or Christian or Jew should consent either; and since we are prepared to guarantee *swadharama* to them all, what wonder is there at all if we desire a similar guarantee of *swadharma* for a Muslim? And yet curiously enough it is just those who would restrict the rights of a Muslim citizen out of deference to non-Muslim sentiments, however out of the common, that demand from him a loyalty to the Government they would establish in disregard of the prior loyalty that he owes to his Maker. It is because Mahatma Gandhi makes no such demands from Muslim or Hindu, fanatic or atheist, but desires all to regard their conscience as their king, that Muslims accept, and can accept his lead in preference to that of the so-called free thinkers as well as that of the orthodox of other faiths. The place of a Muslim who wants an India subject wholly to the rule of Muslims is not India. But India is not any more the place

of a Hindu who wants an India subject wholly to the rule of Hindus. We wish we could believe with Mahatma Gandhi that happily the number of such as want this is few. But few or many, we must all combine to defeat their fanaticism, and to make India safe for *swadharma* and Swaraj.

Having made the requisite reservation in favour of religion, we can now with an easy conscience condemn those who take the name of religion in vain, and who are actuated by material motives which have nothing to do with religion. We are glad to find Mahatma Gandhi agreeing with us in stating that it is interested persons who were disappointed during the palmy days of Non-Co-operation that have found their opportunity now and are trading upon the religious bigotry or the selfishness of both the communities. He agrees with our own ethiology of the disease of disunion and of the dissensions in which that disunion has resulted, and clearly states that the result of the activities of such interested persons is written in the history of the feuds of the past two years. The greatest sufferer from all this is, however, religion itself. As Mahatma Gandhi says, "Religion has been travested. Trifles have been dignified by the name of religious tenets which the fanatics claim must be observed at any cost." But we think it is only a slip of the pen when Mahatmaji writes that economic and political causes have been brought into play for the sake of fomenting trouble. In all probability the Mahatma also thinks as we do, that genuine economic and political grievances existed, and that those who complained on these grounds, or those against whom complaints were made, alike fomented trouble in the name of religion, or at least became ardent champions of hostile communal groups. They did nothing to check and control the religious passions and prejudices of those quarrelling groups, even if they did not originally rouse them, but, on the contrary, they did much to increase them and to aggravate the situation. The Unity Conference at Delhi has, as Mahatma Gandhi says, paved the way for a settlement of religious differences, and let us hope with him that the Committee of the All-Parties' Conference will find a workable and a just solution of the existing political differences as well. We also echo the words

of the Mahatma that "our goal must be removal, at the earliest possible moment, *of* communal or sectional representation. A common electorate must impartially elect its representatives on the sole ground of merit. Our services must be likewise manned by the most qualified men and women." But, while Mahatma Gandhi is not indifferent to the prospects of the future, practical man that he is, he does not neglect the needs of the present either. He rightly concludes this section of his address by saying that "till that time comes and communal jealousies or preferences become a thing of the past, minorities who suspect the motives of majorities must be allowed their way." He calls upon majorities to set the example of self-sacrifice. For our part we shall be content if they only set the example of bare justice. Let no one, however, think that we despair of this, or even that we regard the prospect as distant. The petty-mindedness of majorities and minorities alike is the result of the scarcity that is universal to-day when only crumbs fall to our lot. We quarrel in our hunger over their distribution; but when from being beggars outside the palace gates, we become honoured partakers of the good things served on the festive board within, there will, we feel sure, be an end of this undignified scramble. Let neither Hindu nor Muslim judge the Swaraj that is to come by these present indications which are the fruits not of Swaraj, but of slavery. The difficulty, however, is that Swaraj cannot come unless these indications disappear.

UNTOUCHABILITY

The confidence that all other communities feel in Mahatma Gandhi is amply confirmed by his disinterested championship of the despised and the down-trodden in his own. When others who would not themselves touch them tell the Christians and Muslims, "Hands off the Untouchables," who can wonder that their fellow-feeling is suspect? But Mahatma Gandhi's admission of his own responsibility for all the faults and failings of his people is, if we may say so, notorious; and that being so, he is the last person to shirk the high-caste Hindus' duty in the matter of the

Untouchables. Not a word that he says against those who keep us enslaved would he score out when describing the condition of India's suppressed classes and the responsibility of high-caste Hindus. There is nothing halting or indefinite about his views on the subject. He lets the whole world know that "Hindus cannot claim or take Swaraj till they have restored the liberty of the suppressed classes. They have sunk with the latter's suppression." If the historians have correctly chronicled the doings of the Aryan invaders of India, then he says he has no hesitation in declaring that "our helotry is a just retribution for our having created an untouchable class." The priests may prate, but he has no doubt about it that "it is a blasphemy to say that God set apart any portion of humanity as untouchable. He is no less clear when he "would warn the Hindu brethren against the tendency which one sees nowadays of exploiting the suppressed classes for a political end." He goes further and plainly tells the Pharisees among the twice-born that "to remove untouchability is a penance that caste Hindus owe to Hinduism and to themselves. The purification required is not of Untouchables, but of the so-called superior castes." And who could be more catholic in his views on religion and caste than the *chust* Sanatan.Dharmi—as the Mahatma always claims to be—who says : "God's grace and revelation are the monopoly of no race or nation. They descend equally upon all who wait upon God. That religion and that nation will be blotted out of the face of the earth which pins its faith to injustice, untruth or violence. God is light, not darkness. God is love, not hate. God is truth, not untruth. God alone is great. We, His creatures, are but dust."

Need we emphasise once more after this that when Mahatma Gandhi calls upon majorities and minorities, and Hindus and Muslims to unite, and requires the so-called high-born and the so-called low-born to form one fraternity and become one brotherhood, he only throws down a challenge to our much-vaunted patriotism and our love of liberty, equality and fraternity? May the Almighty give us all the strength to take up that challenge and prove that we deserve the freedom we seek.

SWARAJ SCHEME

The Mahatma has all along concentrated his attention on the means wherewith he would win Swaraj. But there were others, and in particular that embodiment of sweetness and light, Pandit Bhagwandas of Benares, who would not be happy till they got the Mahatma and the Congress to define the Swaraj they were after. Now, Swaraj could only be one thing, and that is Self-Determination. For our part, *we were content to win Swaraj and leave the entire nation after the victory to determine what all wanted. But others were anxious to determine to-day what they would have the power to establish only after victory had been won to-morrow. Knowing what our people were like, we were opposed to the course they suggested. Indians have been brought up so long on unrealities that they have an itch for Constitution-making, imagining that Constitutions can be made by debating societies, and all that is needed to make them is a majority of votes. They have long ceased to make history and to think in terms of history. They do not realise how other nations have sacrificed hundreds and thousands of valuable lives in winning the right to make or repeal a single clause of their Constitution. They forget what enemy they have to fight and wrangle with friends so long and with such pugnacity and persistence—nay with so much rancour and ill-will, that they often turn friends into enemies. So well did the makers of the nation's proverbs know the nation's proclivities that they summed up this particular failing in the saying* :

سوت نہ کپاس کوری سے لٹھم لٹھا

(Neither cotton nor yarn, but blows must
be exchanged in haggling with the weaver.)

But, alas ! the wit of one has not yet become the wisdom of the many. Mahatma Gandhi does not dwell long on the "highly attractive, because speculative, theme" of the future Constitution of India, for, visionary though he be, he is too practical to imitate that too common type among our countrymen, *Shaikh Chillee*, whose ill-fated speculations have supplied our nurseries with one of their most laughter-provoking stories. He may, in the intensity of his devotion to it, and in the strength of his be-

lief in its possibilities, be described by some as the *Shaikh Chillee* of the Charkha. But he tells us that "the end we do not know. For me it is enough to know the means." In other words, he will have no *lattham latha* with the weaver until his Khadi Board has accumulated a sufficient quantity of cotton and of yarn. But since so many of us want a scheme of Swaraj, and the All Parties' Conference has appointed a Committee to frame such a scheme, the Mahatma has placed before the nation his Twelve Points for the consideration of the Constitution-makers.

We are glad he disapproved of a Property Franchise so foreign to the genius of the nation ; but we are no less glad that he does not like to set up in its place a literary test either. "The benefit of the clergy" would be a tyranny if the clergy does not want the laity to share its learning. The monks in Europe did not marry, and they tried to swell their ranks by initiating the poor. But where the clergy marries, and is yet an exclusive caste, as among the Hindus, it is apt to perpetuate its line, and to make learning and the power it brings with it the monopoly of a caste. Let us universalise learning. But unless it becomes the common heritage of all, it is dangerous to create a Literary Franchise. "No work, no vote," should be our slogan to-day, and some test of national service should be devised. To-day it may be hand-spinning; but we are glad that the Mahatma would not confine manual labour for all time to hand-spinning, but would leave it to the action of economic laws once the Charkha is enabled, by the stimulus we now give to hand-spinning, to find its own economic level.

Two of the Mahatma's Twelve Points should clear away much misunderstanding. He would have all monopolies given to foreigners examined by a Commission ; but when that is done, he would give "full guarantees for all vested interests justly acquired." Similarly, he would give "full guarantees of their status to the Indian Chiefs without any hindrance from the Central Government," subject, however, to the right of asylum in self-governing India of their subjects who are not accused of offences "against the Penal Code." This, we hope, we interpret correctly as exclusively offences involving moral turpitude. No

foreinger whose vested interest has been justly acquired and no Indian Chief need fear that injustice will be done to him by self-governing India. Indeed, we trust that every territory of which an Indian Chief has been unjustly deprived by the present foreign Central Government will be ceded back to him. Knowing India States as we do, we feel certain that self-governing India will have no difficulty in dealing with Indian Chiefs, and that Indian States will before long become as self-governing in the truest sense of the term as the rest of India, so that none of the citizens of such States will need to seek asylum outside.

Not the least important point presented for our consideration by Mahatma Gandhi is that which makes Swaraj synonymous with *Swadharma.* The so-called freethinkers are in practice far more intolerant than this "religion-ridden" Hindu and Sanatani who would have self-governing India recognise the "complete religious freedom of various denominations," subject only to mutual forbearance. Where such forbearance is not practised the world becomes a hell. True religion is that which does not permit persecution and compulsion to enter its diocese and the first article of the creed of which is tolerance and forbearance. Hali wrote of those who neither fought the Hindu nor bore ill-will towards the *Gueber* who eschewed evil and rewarded evil with good, and he asked those who thought this world to be a Hell to come and see the beauties of this Heaven. In a sense different from that of Satan in Milton's *Paradise Lost*:

> The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven.

All that we need is to produce the proper religious mentality, and not to make people irreligious.

INDEPENDENCE

Since we could not have hoped to be rid just yet of that hardy annual, the proposal to amend the creed of the Congress and define the Swaraj we seek as Swaraj outside the British Empire or Commonwealth, Mahatma Gandhi did well to devote a section

of his address to the subject of independence. We agree with him that the British recognition of India's complete equality "would be a greater triumph than a complete severance of the British connection." The conversion of the infidel is certainly a greater triumph for the evangelist and the apostle than the elimination of infidelity through the wasteful process of killing the infidels. Was not the triumph of the Last of the Messengers of Allah, who was able to convert his people in his life-time, and who has been acknowledged even by his critics to have been "the most successful" among the prophets, greater than that of Noah, whose prayer was answered when the flood deluged and destroyed his people few of whom had he been able to convert? The Mahatma sees the future with a clear gaze when he tells us that "the better mind of the world desires to-day not absolutely independent States warring one against another, but a federation of friendly inter-dependent States." He desires the ability to be totally independent without asserting the independence. *But, alas! only too many of the champions of complete independence are anxious to assert their independence without doing much to develop the ability to be independent.* It is, we think, manifest enough that "Britain really means subjection in spite of her declarations to the contrary," and it is not because we are in any doubt about this that we would wait and see. We wait because many of us do not yet hate our slavery sufficiently, and our task should rather be to make them realise that they are slaves, and to make them sick of their slavery, than to tell Britain what we think of her declarations.

POLITICS OR SOCIAL REFORM?

How petty in comparison with this "impractical visionary" and "ascetic" are the "politicians" that pride themselves on being practical? If they only knew how very like leaders of schoolboy debating societies they really are, their vanity would greatly diminish, if not utterly vanish. These believers in eternal blab are singing in chorus to-day that the Charkha programme turns the Congress into a purely social reform organisation. We have neither time nor patience for wasting on the philosophy of

nomenclature; but we do know that if the Charkha is not taken up, then we are discarding as a nation the one weapon that we still possess. We are like the straggler who has fallen out of the ranks, footsore and weary, and who finally drops his rifle, now too heavy for hands, into the nearest ditch. The Mahatma's simple and characteristically dispassionate rejoinder to these questioners is that "everything that is absolutely essential for Swaraj is more than merely social work and must be taken up by the Congress." May we ask these sceptics what they would say to a born general who, tired of their endless debates, set about organising the millions of India into a fighting force to win freedom? We know there is no such general to-day, nor does our salvation lie that way. But if they were such a born organiser of fighting men and he could promise us victory, would these debaters and wranglers say to him that the organisation of an army is not *political*—according to the rules of their schoolboy game? If a Garibaldi's organised revolt could be *political*, a Gandhi's organisation of the Charkha and the hand-loom is *political* enough in all conscience for people so circumstanced as we.

NATIONAL EDUCATION

It is not as if Mahatma Gandhi has ceased to do work in connection with other items of Non-Co-operation. It is curious that Mrs. Besant, who seemed only the other day to have definitely agreed to join the Congress, knowing only too well that Mahatma Gandhi was insisting on the spinning franchise and was suspending other items of Non-Co-operation as a national programme only with a view to open the doors of the Congress wide enough for Co-operators like her and the Liberals to enter, is now anxious to found an Indian National *Political* Congress, apparently because after the suspension of Non-Co-operation, the Congress has ceased to be a political organisation. It is on such occasions that one recalls the poet's lament:

میں ہوا کافر تو وہ کافر مسلماں ہو گیا

(When I turned Infidel, that Infidel became one of the Faithful).

So far as Mahatma Gandhi is concerned, every item of the Non-Co-operation programme stands where it did before. We are glad he has emphasised the need of the maintenance of national schools and colleges. We wish Non-Co-operators will take to heart what he says about them. "They cannot be given up so long as even a few pupils are left. It must be a point of honour with the respective provinces to keep up their colleges and schools. Suspension of Non-Co-operation should not have any injurious effect on these institutions. On the contrary, greater effort than ever before should be made to maintain and strengthen them." But we would like to encourage the students also in the existing national institutions of India, and what should encourage them more than the words of the Mahatma who has been quietly watching them. "Throughout the country," says he, "finest and silent work has been done by the non-co-operating students. Theirs is a great and noble sacrifice. From a worldly stand-point they have perhaps lost the prospect of brilliant careers. I suggest to them, however, that from the national stand-point they have gained more than they have lost. They left their schools or colleges because it was through them that the youth of the nation were insulted and humiliated in the Punjab. *The first link in the chain of our bondage is forged in these institutions. The corresponding national institutions, however inefficiently managed they may be, are the factories where the first instruments of our freedom are forged.* After all, the hope of the future centres round the boys and girls studying in these national institutions. I therefore, regard the upkeep of these institutions as the first on provincial funds." We feel it necessary to repeat at once his warning that "the time is past when we can be satisfied with the word 'National' on the signboard of the school and the knowledge that it is not affiliated to any Government University or is not otherwise controlled by the Government." In other words, that school or college or University is not necessarily national which is badly housed and ill-equipped. "Love in a cottage" is better than a palace where love dwelleth not. But a cottage without love is certainly no better, if not worse, than a palace without it.

REPRESSION AND THE REMEDY

It is a sad reflection on our Non-Co-operation and our love of reform that we cannot persist in Non-Co-operation and the work of reform without the use of a stimulant such as an active struggle with Government provides. To cite only one instance, why could not the nation continue to fight against drink, drugs and dopes without the use of such an intoxicant as pugnacious picketing? Some temperance work still goes on, but such silent service has no other chronicler except the Mahatma himself and a few others. Council-work still attracts some of the most energetic among us because of the heady wine of recurring debates.

In the meantime repression goes on in spite of the Council wrangling. Bengal has so far vindicated its manhood by rejecting slavery in the shape of the Bill which sought to make the Ordinance permanent. But this must now be followed up by more solid work on the Charkha, which alone will develop the nation's strength from within. The Mahatma says truly enough that "repression does for a true man or a nation what fire does for gold."

ناکامیوں سے کام محبت کا بن گیا
اک دھات تھی کہ آگ میں پڑ کر نکھر گئی

(Repeated failure accomplished the work of Love. It was a metal that got chastened by the fire through which it passed.)

How truly does the Mahatma says: "In 1921 we answered repression with Civil Disobedience and invited the Government to do its worst. But to-day we are obliged to eat the humble pie. We are not ready for Civil Disobedience. We can but prepare for it. Preparation for Civil Disobedience means discipline, self-restraint, a non-violent but resisting spirit, cohesion, and, above all, scrupulous and willing obedience to the known laws of God and such laws of man as are in furtherance of God's laws. *But unfortunately we have neither discipline nor self-restraint enough for our purpose! we are either violent, or our non-violence is unresisting; we have not enough cohesion, and the laws that we obey, whether of God or man, we obey compulsorily.*"

The daily defiant breach of laws both of God and man which we have been witnessing as between Hindus and Muslims makes the Mahatma inexpressibly sad, and he says that "those who believe that India's deliverance lies through violence are entitled to gloat over the free fights that take place between us." But we doubt if such free fights prepare us even for violence, let alone for Civil Disobedience "the one matchless and invincible weapon at the disposal of the oppressed." It seems to us that little courage is required for this kind of fighting. How will these rowdies face the British army when they cannot even face the Indian Police? These are only mock fights of the cowards in the two communities, and when we see neither the Hindus nor the Muslims behaving against each other as the Sikhs behaved against the Government at Guru-ka-Bagh and against the Mahant's men at Nankana, we are inclined to doubt the Mahatma's statement that "India is admittedly the best repository and exponent of non-violence." What we want are a few deaths of the non-violent who would face a maddened crowd in defence of the sanctity of their places of worship and die without striking a blow themselves. Better still we want the death of a few Muslims and a few Hindus at the hands of maddened crowds of their *own* communities while defending the honour and the sacred places of the *other* community!

What Mahatma Gandhi wants India to discover is a force more potent and more effective than the violence of a violent Government and of violent revolutionaries. He regards repression as a chronic symptom of a chronic disease. That disease is European dominance and Asiatic and African subjection, and he finely tells us that Kipling "miscalled the White Man's Yoke as the White Man's Burden." In Mauritius, in Kenya, in South Africa and in Fiji, just as in Egypt and the Sudan and nearer home at Guru-ka-Bagh and Jaito and in Bengal, it is the same disease, and repression is its surest symptom. Repression, the Mahatma tells us, is not an extraordinary thing whether in Egypt or in the Punjab or in Bengal. "*We must treat its periodic eruption* in some shape or other, in some province or other, *as our normal condition till we come to our own.*" The remedy

lies in devising a sanction to back the demands of the people. There is no rhetoric here but pure and undefiled truth when the Mahatma says: "If we can but speak with a united voice and know our own mind, it would be well. If we can develop the power to keep foreign cloth from our land, it could be better. We are ready *then* for the sanction."

THE MAHATMA'S FAITH AND OUR OWN

There are shrinking souls that always doubt and hesitate, and it was as a tribute that littleness pays to greatness, if not as a tribute that vice pays to virtue, that they joined the ranks of Non-Co-operators after having opposed it as long as they safely could. It is they who are telling us that Non-Co-operation is *abandoned* because Mahatma Gandhi advises its *suspension* when they and their likes are not ready for it. But speaking for himself he tells us that "as an individual *I cannot—will not—do so*, as long as the Government remains what it is. It is not merely a policy with me; it is an article of faith." That faith is ours as well, and of every Muslim's who seeks guidance in the Holy Quran. Mahatma Gandhi tells us that he cannot and will not hate Englishmen; but neither will he bear their yoke. The Prophet was preaching the brotherhood of Islam to his followers, and told them that they should assist their brethren in faith whether they be oppressors or oppressed. Human nature is essentially good, and even the simple dwellers of the desert could not accept unquestioningly the Prophet's dictum that an oppressing brother should be assisted as well as the oppressed brother. So one of them expressed his doubt and wanted the Prophet to resolve it. The Prophet repeated the dictum, but explained that the best way of assisting the oppressing brother was to *prevent* his oppression. Assistance and resistance are in this sense but relative terms, and so are Co-operation and Non-Co-operation. Islam when it taught us to non-co-operate thirteen long centuries before Mahatma Gandhi and his Congress, so that no Muslim can suspend, much less abandon, Non-Co-operation when the Congress or even Mahatma Gandhi may do so, laid down in the Quran the limits of co-operation and non-co-operation for all

time. The dictum of the Quran will stand even when not a vestige of the Congress creed or its resolutions remains, and it is this:

تعاو نو على البر و التقوىٰ ولا تعاونو اعلى الاثم و العدوان

(Co-operate in righteousness and piety, and do not co-operate in sinfulness and transgression.)

Those who were most zealous in the cause of Non-co-operation five years ago and cited the Quran at every turn cannot now be permitted to take a graceful curve and co-operate. They were the most unforgiving and the least charitable of the critics of such Ulama as sought a *heela-i-shara'i* (legal loophole) whenever they desired to transgress an inconvenient law of the Shari'at. Such Ulama have much to answer for; but that cannot absolve their critics who seek just as surely a *heela-i-shara'i* for escaping from the many discomforts of Non-Co-operation. He who acknowledges the law and does not follow it is a criminal; but he is not guilty of high treason and is not a rebel and an outlaw. He who acknowledges the Shari'at and yet departs in his conduct from it is a sinner, but he cannot—must not—despair of God's abounding mercy. But he who would cover his own misconduct under the cloak of a *heela-i-shar'at*, and thus convert his weakness into falseness, is guilty of high treason against God, because in reality he denies God's law by substituting his own for God's. He comes nearest to *shirk*, or "association of others with God," and that, as the Quran repeatedly declares, is not a sin that Allah will pardon. We are all human, and therefore all weak and frail creatures. Let us not on that account deny God's law, but let us rather pray to Him to give us strength enough to abide by it and live in accordance with it.

يا ايها الذين آمنوا استعينوا بالصبر و الصلوٰة انا الله مع الصابرين

(O ye that believe, seek assistance in patience and in prayer. Verily Allah is with the steadfast.)

What is Satyagraha but steadfastness in the cause of Truth? Let us but realise the Truth and it will itself make us free. As the Mahatma says, "Satyagraha never fails, and one perfect Satyagrahi is enough to vindicate the Truth. Let us all strive to

be perfect Satyagrahis. *The striving does not require any quality unattainable by the lowliest among us.* For Satyagraha is an attribute of the spirit within. It is latent in everyone of us. *Like Swaraj, it is our birth-right.*" This striving and this seeking after Truth is the truest *Jihad.* Do not let us say the path is perilous and difficult. That way many a nation was lost. Why not ask Him for endurance and fortitude who tells us

لا یکلف الله نفساً الا وسعها

(Allah taxes not a soul beyond its capacity.)

That is what the Quran taught in the conclusion of the Second Chapter, and no prayer can be better than the Opening Chapter of the Quran or Fatiha, and the conclusion of this the Second Chapter. Let us pray, as we are taught there:

O our Lord! do not punish us if we forget or fall into sin;

O our Lord! lay not upon us a load such as Thou didst lay upon those before us;

O our Lord! lay not upon us that which we have not the strength to bear;

And pardon us, and protect us, and have pity upon us, Thou art our Master.

So help us against the Unbelieving people.

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION

(6th February, 1925)

'It seems to us,' writes Mohamed Ali 'that the whole discussion of communal representation is not only an evil but a necessary evil.' Here he candidly and exhaustively deals with various aspects of the problem.

IX

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION

WHEN the Unity Conference was held at Delhi, last September, Mahatma Gandhi, reading the root cause of Hindu-Muslim discussions, had, among other things, suggested that a Committee should be appointed to invite representative opinion and investigate the whole question of the share of various communities in representation and in the public services and report its findings by a certain date. A large section of the Conference, however, seemed unwilling to take up the question, and the Conference dispersed after adopting certain resolutions based on tolerance and inter-communal accommodation with regard to religions beliefs, observances and propaganda.

When two months later the All Parties' Conference meet, the adjustment of communal shares in representation and in public services was one of the subjects it had to deal with. But since the Conference had also to frame a scheme of Swaraj and devise means whereby all parties could unite with each other and work on the common platform of the Indian National Congress, it was soon felt that the only way to do any real business was to entrust the work to a representative committee. Mahatma Gandhi had, in consultation with others, proposed a score of names for the membership of such a committee, but a scramble took place for inclusion in the committee, and to the Mahatma the only safe course seemed to accept all nominations and to remove the inequalities resulting from such a haphazard "selection" by authorising the committee to co-opt other members from parties or communities inadequately represented.

The Committee was large enough already and the addition of co-opted members made it, when it met at Delhi two months

later, quite as large as the original Conference. This led to the selection of another committee, still very unwieldy, for the purpose of adjusting communal shares, and of yet another and smaller committee to consider and report on the scheme of Swaraj prepared by Mrs. Besant and some others working with her Convention. Little progress was made in the course of the discussions carried on by this latter committee appointed to adjust them led, as if inevitably, to a series of private and informal conversations, and ultimately to the adjournment of further discussion to the end of February.

From this bare chronicle of a barren series of meetings of large committees and small committees, of formal debates and informal conversations, each individual will draw conclusions according to his own individual temperament. The pessimists are no doubt in a majority, and they will naturally tell us that much valuable time has been wasted ; and in all probability the Hindu pessimists will accuse the Muslims of being the obstacle in the way of settlement, and the Muslim pessimists will similarly accuse the Hindus. We are not pessimists ourselves but to us, too, one thing seems plain enough, and it is this. Whatever Mahatma Gandhi and a dozen others of his way of thinking may think, the bulk of the Hindus and Muslims that assembled at Delhi a fortnight ago do not yet appear to us to feel that utter detestation of India's present-day slavery which alone can compel them to adjust their communal differences without delay and to make a united demand for Swaraj. To us every day that passes without the attainment of Swaraj is a course of additional torture, and we confess we find it hard to be patient with those whose interminable arguments on the one side or on the other lead us nowhere. They only serve to remind us of the Tread-mill. They are not idolent, nor are they quiet. On the contrary, they are always busy and often loud. But they only go round and round, and make no progress.

Impatience will not, however, serve any purpose, nor is it possible to obtain Swaraj merely by a few people's utterly detesting the present-day slavery of India. It is true that if an appeal is made by such people to the country at large, and the

masses are told without any reservation or reticence what such people feel at heart about this Tread-mill Tribe of politicians, and how Swaraj is being delayed by their dilatory debates, the masses would lose much of the confidence that at present they mistakenly repose in such procrastinating politicians. But it will mean an open breach with them, and probably a fairly long fight which would be enough to absorb the energies and attention of the small group that is yearning for Swaraj. There are worse things than war, and we may yet have to wage one against these wranglers. But war is certainly a great evil, and although we have been credited with a great deal of militancy, we would like to avoid it as long as we possibly can, and in the meantime to explore every avenue that may be hoped to lead to a reconciliation between the Hindus and the Muslim irreconcilables of to-day.

Our own view is that nothing could be worse than the existing servitude of the nation, and that no second stage of India can be worse than the first. Convinced as we are of this we have no hesitation in telling the Muslims that they will not be the losers if they make no stipulations whatever with the Hindus as regards the future, and make no provisions in the scheme of Swaraj for safeguarding their interests by means of communal representation. We do not say this because we trust every Hindu who talks of communalism as being incompatible with nationalism, while he still thinks that his food would be polluted if a Muslim or a Christian or a Parsee touched it. It is cant and hypocrisy on the part of a very large section of Hindus to talk of nationalism and to rebuke those who give expression to the apprehensions they feel as regards the rights of minority communities of backward classes and who would devise safeguards for them through communal and class representation. If, therefore, we strongly advise the Muslims to give up all thought of communal representation it is because we feel that the mentality does not change for the better, the Muslims will still be able to wrest back the rights of their community from the majority if it continued to remain communal and monopolistic while pretending to be national and just to all. When a commodious ship with sufficient

room for passengers and crews is sailing in smooth waters, there is little temptation to push and hustle and use one's elbows too vigorously. Then the mail passengers smile and bow to the ladies and make room for them in the politest of manners and the crew is only too conscious of its own place and even subservient to the passengers. The real test of the passengers' chivalry and the crew's discipline comes only with the storm and the shipwreck when the boats are being lowered and launched on a turbulent sea. In such cases it sometimes happens that the captain has to pull out his revolver and, while shouting out the order: "Woman and children first," has to stand ready to shoot down the first man who would in his excessive selfishness and terror rush to the boats before his turn and create confusion. To-day we are experiencing a storm and in the scramble for a seat in the boats we have proved ourselves in only too many cases to be both undisciplined and unchivalrous. When Swaraj is established, we feel that this scramble would cease, and politeness and good manners and a proper appreciation of our duties as well as of our rights and of other people's rights and duties would return. With only crumbs from the tables of our rules falling to the 320 millions of India's famishing population there is no wonder if we lack table manners. But with the board groaning under the weight of good things to eat we can be trusted to acquire table-manners, and to cease to scramble. Such is human nature, and it is this human nature that we must all trust even if to-day we do not trust Hindu nature or Muslim nature.

If, however, we ultimately find that we had been too trustful, and that the majority disregards the rights of the minorities, there is no constitution on earth made by lawyer or layman that can prevent our demanding justice and getting it. If justice cannot be obtained by counting heads, it may become necessary to obtain it by cutting them, or by adopting the more human but not less courageous methods of Non-Violent, Non-Co-operation and Civil Disobedience. The Muslims are suspected in some Hindu quarters of desiring to invite their co-religionists from abroad to subvert the Swaraj Government and re-establish Muslim rule. Everything that is humanly possible has been done to remove

this suspicion, and we trust it will not be revived again. But if the Hindu majority itself convert Swaraj into Hindu *raj* pure and simple, Mahatma Gandhi himself would readily admit that Muslims who do not share his religion of non-violence would be justified in seeking the aid of their brothers outside India to put an end to their slavery.

We have every hope that Swaraj will itself prove the sovereign remedy for all our national ills, but if these hopes are belied, there is nothing that can prevent the Muslims from seeking and securing justice through Civil War or through Civil Disobedience. If, therefore, they are unwilling to trust the future, which only means to trust human nature and to trust themselves, that argues woeful debility among the Muslims.

THE HINDU ATTITUDE

Being Muslims ourselves, we have not hesitated to advise them to make no stipulations to-day about communal representation. But if we had been Hindus we would have even more unhesitatingly asked the Hindus to agree to all that Muslims demanded. For after all the Muslims do not demand that the Hindu majority should, in a single case, be converted into a minority, and so long as majority rule is accepted, the Hindu position in all constituencies is safe enough. But if the Muslims have given proof of political debility, the Hindus have shown no greater political virility. We entirely agree with those who do not like the idea of communal representation disfiguring the Swaraj constitution of India. But a communal monopoly is worse than communal representation, and when majority rule is accepted by the minority, it is only right that the minority should be credited with some abhorrence of communal representation. It does not increase a minority's faith in the majority's sincerity if a community enjoying the comfortable position of security that its majority gives it behaves as if it enjoyed a monopoly of the abhorrence of the communal representation. With all the abhorrence that we feel with regard to communal representation, we cannot pretend to think that if it

is allowed to continue for a short period after Swaraj is established, we shall never be rid of it. That would depend upon the treatment that the majority metes out to the minorities and we cannot help thinking that morbid mistrust of communal representation argues on the part of the majority some mistrust of itself. It is not only the Muslims that had given expression to apprehension with regard to the rule of the Hindu majority. Non-Brahmans in Southern and Western India have shown perhaps as great mistrust of the Brahmans, and Ramaswami Mudliars are as much the *karma* of Satyamurtis as Fazl-i-Hussains are the *karma* of Lajpatrais. Communities can evade their *karma* in this world far less than individuals, and it seems to us that there is no help for it but for each generation to pay the penalty for the misdeeds of the previous generation, and to act in such a manner as not to penalise the next generation.

It has been said on behalf of the Hindu community that if communal representation must remain, then the Lucknow Pact is the utmost limit which in such representation can be conceded. The *Comrade* had ceased to be published full two years before the Lucknow pact had been concluded in 1916, and we were in no way responsible for that Pact. Nevertheless we would have favoured its continuance even now that we were framing a Swaraj scheme were it not for the fact that in the Pact Bengal Muslims had been for the time being deprived of their majority and reduced to 90 per cent representation in spite of a Muslim population as high as 54 per cent. That sort of arrangement may be fair for a time, but it cannot be maintained in a permanent Swaraj constitution. Aprrt from that, the reluctance of the Hindus to allow the Muslims to be in majority even in two provinces out of so many is to our mind extremely unsport. The Hindu Mahasabha Committee was anxious that even if the All-Parties Committee arrived at a conclusion which gave Bengal and the Punjab Muslims majorities to which their proportion of population entitled them, but conclusion should only be regarded as tentative, and that no conclusion of this sort should be final uniil it was assured that the Central Government, in which the Hindus were, of course, in a majority, would retain control over

these Provincial Governments. If the strong and even *dominant* Hindu minorities in the Punjab and Bengal can be so nervous with regard to Muslim majorities there, then what wonder is it if Muslim minorities seek to safeguard themselves by means of communal representation?

SEPARATE OR MIXED ELECTORATES?

The question that has been debated at the greatest length, however, is whether communal representation, even if tolerated, should be secured through separate communal electorates or through territorial electorates. Where the minority is too substantial to be swamped by the majority, we certainly think that it should be bold enough to agree to joint territorial electorates, and safeguards such as proportional representation with a single transferable vote or a system of cumulative voting may be utilized. Unfortunately, these safeguards are generally very insufficiently understood, and those who recommend them should explain them to the minorities whose adequate representation they seek to insure. But we know of no method that can ensure a small minority from being swamped by an overwhelming majority, unless it has a number of seats reserved for it, and voting takes place in separate electorates of its own. It is true that in times of communal tension, such as that we have been going through ever since the reaction in far off Punjab of the troubles in Malabar, candidates most hostile to the majority will be returned by the minority voting in separate electorates of its own. But that is the inevitable *karma* of a majority's swamping the minority in a joint territorial electorate, and returning, even when a certain number of seats are reserved for minority, some men of straw belonging to the latter but not in the least representing its views and wishes.

The return of the most bigoted and the most narrowminded members by an infuriated minority in times of communal tension will at least provide a safety valve for the feelings of the minority. But will the situation be improved if the majority community keep sitting down on this safety valve and fill the

seats reserved for the minority community with men *belonging* to it but in no way *representing* it? Such nominees of the majority, pretending to speak for the minority and going into the lobby at the heels of the majority will still further provoke and exasperate the minority, and inter-communal relations, far from being harmonised, will be still further exacerbated. It must be remembered that a minority is after all a minority and no matter what you do for it, "suffering is the badge of the tribe." To deprive it even of minority representation by swamping it is to play the bully and the tyrant, and that is far less compatible with nationalism than communal representation of minorities secured to them through separate communal electorates.

Much of the Swarajist case that council entry is necessary rests on the bitter experience of the first "Reform" Councils when, through the self-denying ordinance passed by the non-co-operators, the Moderates had the entire field of representation left to themselves. Returned to the councils, generally speaking, by the few votes whom they could persuade to come to polling booths, and opposed by Non-co-operating candidates, they spoke in those councils as if they had a mandate from the entire nation and were entitled to speak in its name. There was no end to their assurance and self-complaisance, and this more than anything else infuriated the impatient among the Non-co-operators and led to the Swarajist revolt. At the last election they swept the board in several provinces, and if the Non-changers had not kept aloof, as they did, there would have been fewer Independents and still fewer Liberals than we still find in the Councils. This was because the Non-co-operators had not been in majority in the country and only constituted a small majority, co-operators would have swamped them and Non-Co-operators would have been left totally unrepresented. In such cases the only thing that Non-Co-operators could have done would have been to go to the country and convert it to their own views. The question is, do we want minority communities to remain unrepresented unless they can swell their ranks by religious conversions? Generally speaking, political convictions, and quite a large number of votes sit on the fence and tumble

down almost at the last moments on one side or the other according to the comparative force and effectiveness of the propaganda on the two sides. Religious propaganda is happily not of this kind, and we have already had sufficiently bitter experience recently of propaganda of this character carried on in the religious field among the Malkanas and elsewhere. If we do not want a repetition of such rivalry in the religious field, then to refuse to small minority communities separate electorates of their own, in which they can be secure from being swamped by overwhelming majorities is in practice even worse than disfranchising them. For if they are disfranchised, nobody could at least pretend to speak in their name and commit them to courses of which they do not approve. Let us only and that, like communal representation itself, separate electorates are needed only so long as the temptation on the part of majorities to misrepresent minorities or the mistrust of majorities on the part of minorities persist. When this temptation and this mistrust disappear, neither separate electorates nor communal representation itself are needed.

UNFETTERED CHOICE OF REPRESENTATION

Where communities differ from each other very widely and apprehend that their interests will not be properly looked after by other communities, to give them separate electorates of their own is nothing more than to allow the two parties in a law-suit each to choose its own advocates for both, even if the choice in the case of the advocate of the other party is limited and its advocate is to be chosen from among members of its own community. After all it is the party's *Interests* that are to be represented and advocated, and not its *Creed*. But in law-suit where each party is given the natural right to choose its own advocate, its choice is not fettered, and it is the *best* advocate of its interests from any community. Muslims choose Hindu advocates and attorneys and *vice versa*, and nobody regards this as unnatural. It is all a matter of confidence. We strongly urge that so long as Hindus and Muslims genuinely feel that they

are like parties in a law-suit, and are therefore allowed to choose their representatives themselves without interference from others, they should also be free to choose as their representative the man in whom they have the greatest confidence, irrespective of the creed he holds and the community to which he belongs. It is the freedom of choice that minorities need and it is illogical to give it to them by means of separate electorates and restrict it by compelling them to choose their representatives from a single community. Mahatma Gandhi was a better and more trusted representative of the Muslims of India in the matter of the Khilafat than Mian Muhammad Shafi or even Mr. Jinnah. But we could also name a dozen leading Muslims who would more truly represent the untouchables than an equal number of leading Hindus that we could name. A true nationalist could have nothing better than so to win by his national service the confidence of all communities—other communities as well as his own—as to be returned by any communal constituency for which he chose to stand. The majority of the so-called Nationalists of to-day are suspect, so far as minority communities are concerned, because they spend far more time and energy in running down what they choose to call communalism than in proving their own Nationalism by means of their national service. It is certainly better to work for the good than to rail at the evil.

"Protection of minorities" is a principle that is generally conceded, but it must not be considered to be identical with the representation of minority communities in excess of their proportion in the population in the country. *If the 14 or 15 per cent* of the Muslim population in United Provinces is allowed to return 30 per cent of the representatives, or the 19 or 20 per cent of the Muslim population of the Bombay Presidency, including Sind, is allowed to return one-third of the representatives, the Muslim minority no doubt receives a measure of protection. One may concede this even in the case of the 10 or 11 per cent of Bihar and Orissa returning 25 per cent of the representatives. But we fail to see how the 6 or 7 per cent Muslim population of Madras or the 4 per cent Muslim population of the Central Provinces and Berar is protected, and that, too, in an

"adequate" and "effective" manner, by being allowed to return 15 per cent of representatives in each case.

No real injury can be apprehended to Hindu interests even if Muslim representation in all the provinces in which the Muslims are in a minority is raised in a Swaraj Government to one-third, as in the Bombay Presidency to-day. We can well understand if to-day, with an alien, bureaucratic Government and existing tension between Hindus and Muslims, quite a number of Muslim representatives in the Bombay Council do not follow the Nationalists into the division lobbies, and the leader of the Nationalists in the Council would consequently think twice before agreeing to give to Muslims one-third representation in Bihar and Orissa, Madras and C. P. and Berar also even under Swaraj. But a generous gesture such as this would secure the confidence of the Muslims all over India far more effectively than a hundred speeches on the virtues of Nationalism and on the benefit of Joint Electorates. Only the Muslims must remember that generosity cannot be had under compulsion any more than confidence, and if they cannot be compelled to repose confidence in the Hindu majority, the Hindu majority, too, cannot be compelled to be generous to them.

In the present state of inter-communal feelings, the best thing to do, and the only one consonant with Muslim dignity is:

(*a*) to ask for clear-cut share of representation in exact proportion to population;

(*b*) to leave it to the minority in every constituency to say whether it would have its representation secured to it through separate electorates or would trust to the justice of joint territorial electorates; and

(*c*) to protect the minorities by means of fundamental laws which no majorities could alter and by means of a provision on the lines of the proviso in the Lucknow Pact, that no bill, nor any clause thereof, nor a resolution affecting any community—which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the elected body concerned—shall be proceeded with if three-fourth of the members of the community in that

body oppose the bill or any clause thereof or the resolution.

FUNDAMENTAL LAWS

The Unity Conference has already passed a number of resolutions which declare the rights of various communities and also the manner in which those rights can be exercised without infringing the rights of other communities and with due consideration for their feelings and sentiments. It should not be difficult to frame certain Fundamental Laws incorporating the decisions of the Unity Conference. The late L. Lajpat Rai has spent a great deal of energy in trying to prove that there is no such thing as an absolute right. Either this is a platitude the discussion of which would only serve to make the obvious obscure, or Lalaji has used his talents to make the worse appear the better reason, and to deprive some people in India of rights which in other countries do not need even to be declared. Such abstract reasoning can be productive of no practical good, and if any community in India cherishes any rights which it cannot leave at the mercy of possibly hostile majorities, the proper course for it is to convince the representatives of various communities that they are its undoubted rights, and that they can be exercised without any infringement of the rights of others, and after that to have them embodied into Fundamental Laws.

It is not possible to foresee everything to-day, nor is it proper to multiply Fundamental Laws which cannot be altered except by the unanimous vote of the representatives of the entire nation. Therefore a provision on the lines of the proviso of the Lucknow Pact which we have suggested should be included among the Fundamental Laws of constitution. We are told that although such a proviso existed in the Lucknow Pact, the Government entirely ignored it when framing the Government of India Act and the regulations made thereunder, while adopting the proportion of representation laid down in that Pact. From this we are asked to conclude that the Government will again ignore this proviso. With regard to this we may say that the Government ignored it in the framing of the scheme of Reforms not because

there was any intrinsic difficulty in embodying it in the constitution, nor in the interests of the majority community, but in its own interests, since it wanted to keep its own hands unfettered. In framing a constitution for the Swaraj Government we shall not be studying the convenience of the alien bureaucracy, but of the Indian Nation itself, and there is many a provision that the bureaucracy would like to ignore but which the Nation must insist upon, and this is one of those provisions. It is also said that each community will object to many a reasonable thing that other communities would like to enact or resolve, and thus the Nation would proceed no further on account of such communal obstacles. We must say we do not foresee any such difficulty, because we cannot believe that any community would be guilty of such wanton obstruction as is apprehended, but even if any community could be guilty of it, other communities could soon bring it to its senses by convincing it that two can play that game. The measure we have suggested provides its own corrective and legislative deadlocks would before long compel the obstructing community to make its peace with other communities, and use the proviso only in extraordinary cases, for which alone it is meant.

LOCAL BODIES AND UNIVERSITIES

Many of those who are opposed to communal representation urge that even if it is to be tolerated in Legislative Councils, it should not be extended to local bodies. It seems to us that the whole discussion of communal representation is not only an evil, but a necessary evil, then it must be accepted everywhere that the necessity for it exists. And if the highly educated man that would be returned by the electorates to the Legislative Councils cannot be trusted to represent truly and faithfully the interests of minority communities or special interests, what expectations of such true and faithful representation can we have from the kind of men that are returned as representatives to local bodies ? To our mind this desire to confine communal representation, which is obviously based on mistrusts, to Legislative Councils,

is the greatest condemnation possible of the men of light and leading in India. Like the question of separate electorates, we think the decision on the subject of having communal representation in local bodies or not should be left to minority communities in each constituency. Happy are the people who can do without it, but if they cannot do without it, no one else has a right to compel them to trust representatives selected for them by majorities which they regard as hostile. As for the Universities we see no reason to exclude them. It is not as if misrepresentation or mistrust is the monopoly of the ignorant. The corruption of the best is worst, and Indian degradation is largely due to the defective character of India's leading men. If cowardice, as the Mahatma thinks, is the besetting sin of a large section of the Hindus, and ignorance that of the Muslims, then the greatest national benefactor is that Muslim who can give courage to the Hindus and induce them to shed their fear of the Muslims, and also that Hindu who can arrange to have Muslim children and youths educated in ever-increasing numbers and is thus able to reduce the existing Muslim ignorance. And yet in the Punjab where Hindu-Muslim tension is the greatest, one of the greatest grievances of the Hindus against the Muslims is that the Education Minister, who is a Muslim, has been endeavouring to reduce Muslim ignorance by making it possible for a larger proportion of Muslims to be admitted into the existing educational institutions financed by the State, though still in a smaller proportion than that of their population ! In these circumstances who can say that the majority can be trusted to do justice to the minority in Universities and other educational bodies. If it cannot be trusted in one case, it can be trusted in no case, and if it can be trusted in one case, it can be trusted in all.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Last but not least is the question of the adjustment of communal shares in public services. Were it merely a question of the loaves and fishes of the office, even then there is no reason

why the division of these loaves and fishes should not be fair to all communities. But since it is the public servants that execute the laws framed by the Legislature, to permit any community to monopolise the executive is just as bad as, if not worse, than permitting it to monopolise the Legislatures. The only question we have to settle is that, whereas selection of the legislators is left to the constituencies, and they are responsible for electing the most efficient persons for the job, what other body must select the executive? The whole subject of communal representation, mixed and separate electorates, reservation of seats, proportional representation and cumulative voting, has been discussed so often and so long only because it is agreed on all hands that a method should be devised which should as far as possible eliminate the chances of partiality in the selection of legislators. How then can the selection of the executive be left to take care of itself, and no effort made to devise some scheme which would similarly eliminate the changes of partiality in this sphere? As a matter of fact, it is against the bureaucratic executive, which is the citadel of this alien bureaucracy, that the most determined onslaughts have been made by the fighters of the nation, and the bureaucracy too has been far more reluctant to agree to the Indianisation of the executive than the Indianisation of legislatures. The same appears to be true of the Hindu majority, and precisely on the same old ground of greater efficiency. Oh! Efficiency, what injustices and what jests are perpetrated in thy name! For the sake of efficiency itself it is necessary to appoint an impartial Public Services Board, on which all communities should be adequately represented and which should see that all communities receive impartial "patronage." As for efficiency the rule should be that for every grade of public service a certain minimum standard of literary qualifications, among others, should be fixed: but so long as the members of a community satisfy that minimum standard of education required for that particular grade of service, they should not be kept out merely because members of another community satisfy just a little higher standard, even though the former community is inadequately represented in the public service, while the latter community is represented in excess of its numerical

protection. Efficiency must be safeguarded in fixing the requisite minimum standard and adhering to it, and not by closing our eyes to the weakness of human nature which is well illustrated by our national proverb :

اندھا بانٹے ریوڑی پھیر پھیر اپنے ہی کو دے

(The blind man distributes sweets and time after time hands them over to his own kith and kin.)

The alien bureaucracy has been doing nothing less than this and we have all condemned it. Can we condemn it any the less because a section of our nation appears to be equally grasping and acquisitive ?

One word more and we have done. Lala Lajpat Rai in his questionnaire circulated among Hindu associations and leading men, does not forget to ask whether the redistribution of provinces is advisable. The Congress has already redistributed the provinces on the linguistic basis, and Mahatma Gandhi in his Presidential Address at Belgaum has made such a redistribution one of his Twelve Points. But it is from the Punjab that we hear once more about the need of redistribution and that apparently on no basis at all except this that the Hindus consider it insufferable to remain in a minority in the Punjab. They would therefore minimise the apprehended effects of being in a minority for as large a portion of the Hindus of the Punjab as possible by dividing their Province into two, so that the largest possible section of the Hindus of the Punjab may be rid of Muslim "dominance" even if all cannot escape that horrible fate ! Now the Punjab is after all not a very large province as provinces go, and if any province is unwieldy it is the United Provinces. No division on a linguistic basis can, however, be made there, and no Muslim has yet devised a method of ridding the Muslims whose ruling families had their habitation in the United Provinces of Hindu "dominance" in that province. It is very curious that the very people who preach to us oftenest the doctrines of trusting Hindu majorities show the greatest mistrust of the Muslim majority in the Punjab. Not by such timidity and not by such tremors will nationalism be advanced and communalism eliminated from the soil of India.

We have exhaustively dealt with all aspects of this question, and in doing so we have used as much candour as in conversant with courtesy. Frankly we are not impressed with the high brow Hindu attitude, nor yet with the Muslim attitude indicative of not a little of mendicancy and of a complete lack of self-confidence. On both sides there has been an exhibition of spirit of driving a bargain. While the two "High Contracting Parties" are still haggling, the Higher Contracting Third Party continues to domineer over both. This thing must end, or we must close all discussion and settle down to enjoy the perpetual slavery. The Hindus too need Swaraj, but they must know that it is not easy to win it without their winning the confidence of Muslims. But to our mind the Muslims need it far more than the bulk of Hindus, and they must purchase it at any price. They cannot, of course, purchase it at the cost of their honour or faith, for nothing can be Swaraj for which honour or faith have to be bartered away. Short of that, they can pay everything and still buy it cheap.

Once more we say to the Muslims, trust human nature, trust yourself and trust God. Do not tolerate for a minute longer the slavery that keeps both body and soul in chains. If you hesitate you are lost. Make no stipulations for the future but ask for Swaraj without any terms without any conditions. Demand it. Struggle for it, suffer for it, and die for it, for when it is won the entire face of the nation will be changed, and you will be safe enough without communal representation, without separate electorates and withont a fixed share in the public services. Above all Swaraj must mean *Swadharma*, and if you value religious freedom more than others, as you think, yours must be the larger sacrifice. But while we say this, we know that it is the easiest thing for the Hindus to remove Muslim mistrust of Swaraj by a generosity that will cost them but title.

IN DEFENCE OF GANDHIJI'S LEADERSHIP

The late Lala Lajpat Rai contributed some articles to the *Hindustan Times* and the *People.* The articles were construed to be an attack on Gandhiji's leadership. Mohamed Ali, a great friend of the Mahatma, came out with a suitable reply in the *Comrade* in 1925.

X

IN DEFENCE OF GANDHIJI'S LEADERSHIP

NOBODY can accuse Lala Lajput Rai of having denied to us his "light and leading" since his return from Europe last September. The Hindu community is not ideally organised to-day, in spite of its phenomenally rigid and minute caste-system and the elaboration of its religious ritual, which the orthodox follow closely even though the unorthodox treat it with utter indifference. Instead of criticising Muslims and acting as their mentors, Hindu leaders could well have set about reforming and reorganising Hindu Society. But with Lalaji charity does not begin at home, and his first beneficence was directed towards the Muslims when he assailed them in a series of ten articles contributed simultaneously to several daily newspapers, the first of which appeared towards the end of November last. Then he began to contribute to the *Hindustan Times*, which had now become the property of the leader of Hindu Sangthan, Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya, a series of vigorous articles critical of the Swaraj Party. These were followed by a still more vigorous Presidential Address delivered in connection with the Hindu Mahasabha and its branches, and then came the series of articles "From Ravi to Brahmputra" contributed to *Hindustan Times* in which Lalaji surveyed the Hindu world in its relation to the Muslims.

All this was but a prologue to the real theme of self-revelation to be taken up week after week in the columns of a *Review* of his own in which he announced he would impart education in politics and in political leadership to Indians. After criticising other political leaders in his Urdu organ, the *Bande Mataram*, in its issue of 26th June, Lalaji informed the youth of India that he had now resolved to give them the true milk of the political gospel in his English weekly *Review*, of which he asked them to pre-

serve the entire file, since he hoped that this *Review* would bring to them "true light not only concerning Indian politics but also concerning the politics of the world, they would become acquainted not only in theory but also in practice with all the secrets (or mysteries) of politics." This review was designed to be "a good political pedagogue." It is at last out, the first issue having been published on the 15th July. So far five issues have appeared, and although we were unable to obtain the second issue until very recently, we have carefully gone through the other four. Whether our enterprising contemporary would or would not bring "the true light not only concerning Indian politics but also concerning the politics of the world" and whether India's young men would or would not "become acquainted not only in theory but also in practice with all the secrets (or mysteries) of politics," it will certainly provide them with a good deal of self-revelation on the part of the would-be political pedagogue of India and the East.

"There is no leader but Lalaji" should more appropriately have been entitled "myself,"—if not "I by itself I"—published in the first issue of the *People* over the *facsimile* of Lala Lajpat Rai, contains an attempt at inconoclasm. But, taken in conjunction with the earlier self-revelation in the columns of the *Bande Mataram* (not to mention the still earlier and expensive self-revelation in the series of articles and addresses that we have mentioned), and also with much that had since appeared over the initial "L. R." in the issues we have so far received, the attempt at inconoclasm is not only an attempt but is a double attempt. It is an attempt at breaking up that idol of the people, Mahatma Gandhi, and other comparatively minor idols, and also an attempt at setting up another idol of the people who is none other than the possessor of the initial "L. R." It is a quasi-Muslim credo, for it not only denies other gods but also sets up in the place of numerous false seeds scattered like nine pins the true and only deity worthy of worship—"L.R." "I believe in freethinking" is an excellent profession of faith. But few will follow this faith if the corollary is to be: "I alone shall think freely," and others are to remain "intellectual parasites" living on the intellectual

food provided week after week by the editor of the *People* acting as the host. "I believe in freethinking. I also believe in discipline and obedience to true leadership." This is what the Lalaji tells us. But the self-revealing Lalaji compels us to read between the lines. And I am the only true leader, the others being all false, in particular the so-called Mahatma, who has brought us nothing but ruin during the last four or five years.

Those who pretend to think that we bear particular ill-will to Lalaji and are only caricaturing and lampooning him, instead of painting a portrait according to life will do well to read the following extract from the "canon's opening roar" in the first article of the first issue of the *People*, and to say if this is not an attempt to caricature and lampoon Mahatma Gandhi : and those who have recognised in him a true leader worthy of being followed by a well disciplined nation in obedience to the call of Truth itself. Here is Lalaji's furious onset.

> Melodrama and an excess of sentimentality have no place in politics. For some time we have been busy making experiments with schemes which could not possibly be carried out without an immediate radical change in human nature. Politics deal primarily and essentially with the facts of a nation's life and the possibilities of its progress in the light of them. Human nature cannot be changed in months and years. You may require decades, even centuries, for that. Prophets and dreamers and visionaries are the salt of the earth. The world would be poor without them. But a campaign of political emancipation of a nation under foreign rule imposed and maintained at the point of the bayonet cannot be based on an attempt to change human nature quickly. Such attempts are bound to fail and end in disastrous action.

If this is not enough, read what has gone before :

> I am afraid that last four or five years have been a period of intellectual laziness on our part. We have been rather obsessed by the idea of not weakening the influence of our leaders, and have let the work of leading be done by one or a very few men. The result is that after a brief period of great activity, we are now passing through a period of reaction to which laziness, indolence, unwillingness to think and a fear of unpopularity add their own forces. Time has come when the nation should be led out of these habits of sloth and inactivity.

THE "DOUBLE ATTEMPT"

Is this not the "double attempt" to which we have alluded, the attempt to break other idols, and particularly that idol of the people, Mahatma Gandhi, and set up for the people's worship the idol of Lala Lajput Rai himself? What is the "Melodrama" and "excess of sentimentality" to which Lalaji alludes if he does not mean the self-purification, through fasts and prayers of the originator of the Satyagraha movement, or rather every prophet, sage and seer's doctrine of love? What are the experiments with schemes which could not possibly be carried out without an immediate radical change in human nature, other than the Mahatma's preparation for Civil Disobedience, with his insistence on the word "Civil" and his rigid adherence to non-violence in thought, word and deed? And who but the Mahatma himself is the dreamer and the visionary whose class is the salt of the earth, and without whom the world would be poor, but who must not poke his saintly nose in a "campaign of political emancipation," and must leave it to the worldly wise leadership of men like the Lalaji? Is it any other than the new era inaugurated since "the coming of the Mahatma," which put an end, at least for a time, to the sham and hypocrisy and cant of our political gatherings, and about which the present writer said in his address as the President of the Indian National Congress at Cocanada that "there was no longer a plethora of the speeches suggestive of midnight oil," full of sound and fury, signifying nothing, and there was a new earnestness which indicated that the resolutions of the Congress were resolutions indeed, in the sense that the resolution was resolved to act,—is it any other than this era of "initiation, courage, braving dangers and taking risks," to use Lalaji's own words, for which he pretends to pine, as if "the coming of the Mahatma" deprived us of them?—is it any other era than this about which he says, "I am afraid the last four or five years have been a period of intellectual laziness on our part. We have been rather obsessed by the idea of not weakening the influence of our leaders and have the work of *leading be done by one or a very few men?*"

"WILLING TO WOUND AND YET AFRAID TO STRIKE"

We ask, what difference is there between this and the C.P. undermine Mahatma Gandhi's influence—between this and Baba Saheb Paranjpye's speech at the A.I.C.C. meeting at Ahmedabad last year in which he told the Mahatma that there were five and a half millions of Sadhus in India with whom he was better fitted to keep company than to lead such *soi disant* disciples of Tilak, the practical politician—between this and Mr. Deshmukh's courteous invitations to the Mahatma to get out of the Congress? What difference is there between the statement of Lala Lajpat Rai as to the purpose he has in view in publishing the *People* and those other fulminators against Mahatma Gandhi, of course except that Lalaji's well-known lack of courage in letting us know what is really in his heart. We do not know if the Punjabi Pedagogue of Politics reads poetry also, and has ever read in the polished satire of Pope the description of "Attecus" who was Addison in real life. It should interest him to read of men who—

"Dawn with faint praise, assent with civil leer
And without sneering teach the rest to sneer.
Willing to wound and yet afraid to strike,
Just hint a fault and hesitate dislike."

Lalaji's disguise of his attitude is, however, not so subtle. In the Punjab they are far too downright to be really subtle, though they do not always admit all that they feel and even say in so many words.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE LALAJI'S POLITICAL CHURCH

Evidently others besides ourselves also suspected that Lalaji was out to dethrone and depose Mahatmaji, and even to spare Malviyaji, an idol of the Hindus of the North, and so Lalaji has indulged in some more self-revelations though he did not cer-

tainly intend this time to reveal his real self—and published the Thirty-nine articles of his Political Church in the *People* of the 26th July under the heading "My Political Creed." It will interest our readers to read the following extract:

> My relations with Mahatma Gandhi are of the most cordial and pleasant nature. We differ very widely in principles and programmes, and even more so in temperament and behaviour. He is an ideal friend. He has written to assure me that he considers me to be 'one of his dearset friends' and that, since he 'discovered me at Nagpur,' has had no occasion to change his opinion of me. I am sure if I have misread his letter he will correct me. My attitude towards him is one of unbounded love, admiration and respect, he and Malviyaji are for me the two greatest personalities in the country. I differ from both not only in temperament but also in principles and programmes. Yet I love and respect them both as I love no other in public and in private. But the idea of displacing them in the leadership of the country can never enter my brain. In spite of all my love and admiration for them I consider them to be only fallible human beings who are not far from blame or error. In my judgment they do at times commit blunders. And if I am anywhere near them I do not hesitate to tell them so, or to send them a message to that effect. What to some may appear "insolence", "impertinence," or "impudence," seems to me to be a clean duty and an act of the greatest friendship. I do not care what other people think or say, so long as the sweetness and forbearance of these friends allows me to do my duty in my own imperfect and at times rude way. They know my motives and understand me as perhaps no one else does. I am content with that.

UNBOUNDED "LOVE" OR UNBOUNDED "CANT"?

We rejoice to learn that Lalaji's "relations with Mahatma Gandhi are of the most cordial and pleasant nature," and that Mahatmaji considers him to be "one of his dearest friends," but it does not disprove his obvious desire to displace him in the leadership of the country, in spite of his flat denial of it and it speaks volumes for the Mahatma's admitted "sweetness, forbearance and patience" that Lalaji's equally admitted "rude way" of doing what he tells us is his "duty" does not affect those relations "of the most cordial and pleasant nature." Few will pretend to say that their attitude towards any man is of "*unbounded love, admiration and respect.*" But such is Lalaji's attitude towards

the Mahatma. Well, here are some passages from Lalaji's article contributed to the *Leader* of March entitled "Mr. Gandhi on the Hindu-Muslim question," expressive of his "unbounded love, admiration and respect." After reading them most people would call it unbounded cant and hypocrisy for the author of these passages to profess "*unbounded love*, admiration and respect."

Here are these precious passages:

I have read Mahatma Gandhi's latest article on the Hindu-Muslim question, and I regret to say that I have not been very much impressed either with its logicality or its general soundness. *Mahatma Gandhi's Protestation about his being an unbiassed observer leaves a bad taste in the mouth.* Evidently he refers to the impression, widespread among the Hindus, that in the Hindu-Muslim question, he starts with a bias in favour of the Muslims. Rightly or wrongly the impression is there, *and no amount of protestation by Mahatma Gandhi to the contrary will remove it unless he suits his conduct to his profession.* My love, admiration and respect for Mahatma Gandhi is more genuine than that of some other men who whilst exploiting him in public for their party purposes, do not hesitate to ridicule him in private. But with all my *love, admiration and respect for him I cannot help thinking that Mahatmaji is not entirely unbiassed in his treatment of the Hindu-Muslim question.* The bias is unconscious and even well-intentioned, but it is there.

There is one thing more to complain about his conclusions on this question. He comes *out with his definite, positive opinions without studying different sections of the question in all their bearing and without trying to collect facts relating thereto. This happens for the simple reason that he is always in a hurry to have matters settled finally without giving people time to properly study and think over them. When he stumbles over facts not known to him before, he at once comes out with an exclamation.*

Yet he would neither take time nor give time sufficient to master facts. I am extremely sorry to observe that while the Non-co-operation movement brought about immense awakening in the masses, Mahatma Gandhi's cry of "Swaraj within one year" did hurt us politically. In fact, I do not hesitate to say that Non-co-operation campaign has been one of the portent causes of increasing friction between the Hindus and Muslims . . . We have done many a stupid thing during the past five years by the rushing through and by the assumption that one or a few wise men can do the whole thinking for us . . . I know; here are many leaders in different parts of India who think on these lines, but they would not permit me to use their names. Being a timid man, I take the entire risk of this unpleasantness.

SOME "FACTS" OF OUR NATIONAL LIFE

We think we have given enough proof of "the unbounded love, admiration and respect" of Lala Lajpat Rai for Mahatma Gandhi and in support of his profession that "the idea of displacing him in the leadership of the country can never enter in his brain." No one can doubt after this that his chief desire it to displace Mahatma Gandhi in his leadership and to give to Indians, which means to the Hindus, for even he must despair of Muslims—a true lead himself. We agree with him that "politics deal primarily and essentially with facts of a nation's life, and the possibilities of its progress in the light of them." But has he never considered what are the facts of the Indian national life? We shall be only too ready to do without "prophets and dreamers and visionaries," and particularly without Mahatma Gandhi, even though Lalaji calls them "the salt of the earth," and says that "the world would be poor without them." Nation's life and the possibilities of its progress in the light of them, and the character of our own brand of "human natural," make it all likely that we would do without such quick changes. But is not the crawling lane of "the facts of our national life," after all, the courage that it showed in Lalaji's own province in killing and burning British bank managers and assaulting British women? Are not the cat and dog quarrels of Hindus and Muslims, particularly in his own province, the facts of our nation's life? If Lala Lajput Rai can wait for decades and even centuries for changing such "human nature," he is quite welcome to do that. So far as the Mahatma and those who believe in him and follow him are concerned, such cowardice and such quarrels must not continue for a single day, let alone months and years. True, it may take months and years to get rid of them, and even decades or centuries if men like Lalaji are to lead the two communities. But we must trust "human nature" better than Lalaji does, and must continue to appeal to the manhood of India and to Indian patriotism to get rid of them in a single night. It may not be possible to do far better in this respect than Lalaji's Punjab has yet done, and Sawaraj can be won in one year if even a small portion of the 320 millions

can be induced to be more brave and more brotherly. Is this impossible? Yes, if men like Lala Lajpat Rai are to lead the youth of India. No, if it is men like Mahatma Gandhi that are to lead. That is the conclusion at which we have arrived and to which we give expression though it be, like Lalaji, in a "rude way."

TRIED AND FOUND WANTING

Lala Lajpat Rai and his tribe of leaders were given a long enough trial in leading a "campaign of political emancipation." They were all "practical politicians," and not those abject beings, "prophets and dreamers and visionaries," whose chief fault is that they can see beyond their noses, while the "practical politicians" cannot see very clearly even what lies under their very noses. In those days the Congress, as it actually existed, was in accord with Lala Lajpat Rai's ideal. It worked as if all the 300 millions of India's population had no religion. It not only never took up any course such as the defence of the Khilafat as a national cause, but continued to ignore the existence of the community that had ruled some part or other of India, and nearly almost the whole of it, for close upon twelve centuries. For this and for other reasons the Muslims as a community kept entirely aloof. So did the Sikhs and the Mahrattas and Rajputs and other people of military traditions. Except for a handful of Parsees, it was a Congress representative only of such portions of the Hindu community as had taken to English education and filled Government offices and the law courts. Except for that brave champion of Indian freedom by his own sufferings, and some others who were equally ready to suffer, though actually they were not called upon to suffer, leading Congressmen were gentlemen of the independent and moderate type who acted as if a nation could be given freedom by the resolutions of debating societies. All honour to Lala Lajpat Rai himself that he bore his deposition, which was such a novel thing in those days, without flinching. These leaders were certainly not in touch with the masses in anything like the sense in which Mahatma Gandhi is in touch with them to-day. Apart from

occasional protests made on sparsely attended "Public Meetings" held in the chambers of some local or provincial association, they met once a year in the Congress for three days in the Christmas week for Lala Lajpat Rai's "campaign of political emancipation of a nation under foreign rule imposed and maintained at the point of the bayonet," and called it "the week of sacrifice." This is what used to take place before "the coming of the Mahatma"—and after Lalaji had come. Is Lalaji willing to go back to that period if he is so dissatisfied with "the work of leading done by one or a very few men" like Mahatma Gandhi, Deshbandhu Dass, Hakeem Ajmal Khan, Pandit Moti Lal Nehru and Maulana Shaukat Ali? The whole output of one Congress in the first generation of thirty years not losing sight of the educative work it did among the classes that have received English education, could not equal the work it did in the three sessions of Amritsar, Nagpur and Ahmedabad and the special Session of Calcutta—in spite of Lala Lajpat Rai's own hesitancy.

"IT WAS TIME TO TRY ANOTHER ROAD"

When at Nagpur Mr. Jinnah, who opposed the creed of the Congress, asked the Non-co-operators why a change in the nation's political outlook was necessary, the present writer was tempted to repeat a story he heard in England, even though it was fit for a smoking room than for the Subjects Committee of the Congress. Lala Lajpat Rai tempts him to repeat the story here. A salvation army preacher was once preaching in Piccadilly in the neighbourhood of midnight and asking the people to follow him on the road to salvation. A seasoned club man, who had dined only too well and was far from unfamiliar with the ways of Piccadilly, stopped on his way home from his club when he heard such a novel sermon from a prominent pulpit in Piccadilly. He raised his eyes, surveyed the whole group of preacher and congregation, and with the smile of the polite and the curious asked the man who wanted all to follow him on the road to salvation. "Beg pardon, but might I ask whether you have yourself trod on this road to salvation?" The salvation

army preacher zealously replied: "Yes, Sir, I have trod that path for full fifteen years!" On this the club-man of Piccadilly said, "Ah! is that so? Well, if after full fifteen years' treading the road to salvation has brought you at this hour to Piccadilly, if I were you I would try another road!" Lala Lajpat Rai's Hindu Congress, before entering which every man had to leave his religion behind, or, at least, treat it like his private tooth brush, had brought us to the Crawling Lane of Amritsar and it was time that Mahatma Gandhi, dreamer and visionary though he be, should take the lead even in a "campaign of political emancipation," and try another road than the one of irreligion and playing at politics.

LALAJI'S ENVIABLE DETACHMENT AFTER THE TIDE OF POPULARITY RECEDED

If Lala Lajpat Rai writes as if he was nothing but a critic of the mad ways of the Mahatma during the last five years, and had not been tried along with his tribe all those years before Amritsar and found wanting, he writes with equally enviable detachment of the last five years themselves, although he was as much responsible for them as Mahatma Gandhi or any other Non-co-operator. It is true he vehemently opposed the Mahatma at the special session at Calcutta at which he presided, and was inclined to do the same at Nagpur, but became evidently shy in they very Students' Conference over which he presided in spite of his disdaining to-day to entertain any "fear of unpopularity." But when Deshbandhu Dass broke away from him in spite of their arrangement at Benares only a few weeks earlier, all his scruples against Non-co-operation and the Mahatma's mad methods evaporated into thin air, and he was at least willing, if not anxious, to second the Non-co-operation resolution before sixteen thousand of his fellow-countrymen. Can he point to a single occasion before the *Sangathan* movement when he opposed any of the methods followed by Mahatma Gandhi? The fact is that, like so many of the back-sliding men of his province, he deserted the Mahatma the moment the tide of popular favour began to

ebb away from the Non-co-operation movement and began to flow in the direction of communal separation. However uncongenial the rigours of Non-co-operation may have been to him, he was willing enough to ride on the crest of the wave when Non-co-operation was at full-flood. But when communal dissensions made it possible for him to lead the Hindus, he transferred his allegiance and his affections from the Non-co-operating Congress of Mahatma Gandhi to the Hindu Mahasabha of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. Lala Lajpat Rai is, therefore, only an *edition de lux* of the "leaders" of the Punjab and seeks but the plaudits which partisans offer as homage to the leader of the hour.

A MISNOMER

Well, he has made his choice between history and the passing hour, and if so be it; so let it be. But let him not pretend that he in any way represents the people of India. Lalaji's new organ wherein he indulges in self-revelation, which some people would call self-advertisement, should not have been named the *People.* Where the first person singular is likely to be in constant use it would be better for Lalaji to buy the copyright from our Allahabad contemporary and to call his journal the *Leader.* That certainly is more in keeping with the gentleman who gives to the compilers of the Telephone Directory at Delhi his name and address as "Lajpat Rai Lala (All-India Leader), Near Lady Hardinge Medical College."

At Cocanada one of the U. P. delegates was asked in a certain street of the town by a group of visitors whether he was a leader. This delegate had a sense of humour, and instead of denying the mild impeachment, he replied: "In my district I am certainly a leader, and I am trying hard to become a leader in the province also. But truth compels me to say that I am not an All-India leader." But it is a novel thing even for All-India leaders to advertise the fact in telephone directories.

To do the Lalaji justice, it was perhaps some secretary who is responsible for this classification of leadership finding its way into the Delhi Telephone Directory. But, when can any "All-

India Leader" say that he is not his secretary keeper? As a rule, nobody is hero to his valet or to his wife, and perhaps secretaries come somewhere between valet and wives. Our secretaries proclaim us to be heroes only when they can be sure that the advertisement would please us. It may be that some secretaries think that the halo is big enough for a companion star as well as the moon, and, therefore, cannot rest unless their moon gets its halo around it and allows the secretary's star to slip into the halo. But we have the secretaries that we deserve. Who can imagine Mahadeo Desai to ask the compilers of a telephone directory to print therein that "Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Mahatma," is an "All-India Leader?" Nevertheless Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi is both a Mahatma and the only "All-India Leader" in spite of Lala Lajpat Rai's frantic efforts to displace him.

"FREE THOUGHT" OR "SLAVE MENTALITY?"

So far we have examined Lala Lajpat Rai's motives behind his professed purposes in publishing the *People.* Let us now examine a little the reasons that he has advanced in support of his purpose. Lala Lajpat Rai's main reason appears to be that "the coming of the Mahatma" led to the loss of a thinking few, that it has induced intellectual laziness, indolence, unwillingness to think and a fear of unpopularity," that the rigid discipline that followed has gone to the extent of "strangling free thought and stiffling free discussion," and the result has been "intellectual stagnation," that "we have been rather obsessed by the idea of not weakening the influence of our leaders, and have let the work of leading be done by one or very few men," which has resulted in "habits of sloth and inactivity." Now, is this a fact? Let us examine. The most patent fact of our national life was the slave mentality which made our educated classes think that we ourselves were capable of doing nothing, that the British ways were indispensable; that "the British connection," even if it continued to be what it has been ever since the first steps of British rule is a "dispensation of Providence and unalter-

able like the laws of Nature. Just as a snake by its fixed gaze binds a spell on its intended victim, or as the snake-charmer binds a spell by his ground flute on the snake itself which he means to make his captive for the sake of his daily bread, our masters had hypnotised our educated classes by the education imparted us in our schools and colleges."

The present writer must confess that nobody had been more effectively under the spell of the British than he himself when he wrote in the *Comrade* of the 12th August 1914, soon after the outbreak of the Great War, that "There are still some people among Indians themselves, and though they do not advertise the offer of their personal services to the Government, whatever influence they possess with the people would be used to decrease rather than increase the Government's embarrassment. They would offer no better guarantee than this that *they regard India's connection with Great Britain at the present stage of India's growth indispensable*, and we are sure the less lofty motive of self-interest would wear better and stand the strain of circumstances longer than the lip-loyalty of Jee-Hazurs." After recounting a large number of occasions on which Britain had betrayed India and the Muslims of India, the present writer had said:

"Irrespective of any or all the consideration, or rather because *we have carefully weighed them all against the one supreme consideration, our need of England and her tutelage at the present stage of our national and communal growth*, and found the good exceeding by great deal her evil, we shall remain loyal with a sincere devotion and an unbought submission, and whether she crushes the naval power of Germany and becomes a dictator to Europe, or the last ship of her mighty Armada sinks in the North Sea and her last soldier falls down and dies round Liege or London."

Such was the spell that Britain had cast round educated Indians, including such of them as could not by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as sycophants and servile. It was this spell cast on the intellect of India that had totally paralysed us, and it was Mahatma Gandhi who broke this spell and changed this slave mentality by thinking freely and teaching others to

think freely too. It was through his precept and practice that we learnt the lesson of "initiative, courage, braving dangers, taking risk" which, as Lala Lajpat Rai rightly says, "all form a part of the moral courage which an independent nation is called upon to bring into play." When the Mahatma was made by the nation its Dictator at Ahmedabad, the present writer said to his companion in the prison ward, where he then was, that he alone could be trusted as Dictator because he is the only one of our leaders who hates to dictate. Who, then, is the man who can come forward and dare to say that Mahatma set a seal over his brain and stopped him from thinking? As a matter of fact, it was only incidentally that the Mahatma's movement would have paralysed the administration. As the present writer said in his Cocanada Presidential Address, "it did not directly aim at the paralysis of others, its direct aim was to remove our own paralysis." And yet it is the author of such a movement who is accused of having brought about the result that "the great part of the thinking community was relieved of the duty of vigorous thinking" and, in its place, was substituted "intellectual parasitism or intellectual laziness."

It is all very well to write in this fashion, but we challenge Lala Lajpat Rai to produce even a couple of examples of free and vigorous thinking from his own speeches and writings and those of the other leaders who shared with him the political guidance of India before the 1919 Congress to equal Mahatma Gandhi's restatement of the doctrines of Non-violent Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience, and his rediscovery of the neglected Charkha—which had sunk even from the position of furniture to that of fuel—and his rehabilitation of it as the most important weapon in our nation's armoury. Like all great and original thoughts the rediscovery of the Charkha was such a simple thing that through its very simplicity it has attracted greatness. The fact is that the educated classes of India have so got used to long and elaborate foreign prescriptions that they turn up their educated noses at a simple remedy like the Charkha prescribed by a Vaidya of their own. Now except for Lokmanya Tilak's rediscovery of the great truth that "Swaraj is our birth-

right," the political thinking of the previous thirty years had produced very little indeed, if we compare it to the great truths ennunciated or restated by Mahatma Gandhi and yet Lalaji is not content.

LALAJI'S IDEA OF DISCIPLINE

And to what does he attribute this freezing up of the current of political thought at its source? To the rigid discipline that had been imposed by the Mahatma. As we explained in our series of articles entitled "The Day of our Defeat," ever since Moses and Aaron were deserted by the undisciplined rabble of the Israelites has any leader of a people suffered such a defeat and so much humiliation through indiscipline as Mahatma Gandhi?

The defection of the Swarajists at Gaya did not demonstrate any very shocking discipline. After the Gaya session some nine months were wasted in vain efforts to keep the Swarajists within the bounds of Mahatmaji's Non-co-operation, and when the present writer and Lalaji were released about the same time, they had both to decide what advice to offer to the Congress. Lalaji from his sick-bed pleaded for "unity" at the cost of "discipline," and the present writer did his "bit" and succeeded beyond his expectations in inducing the No-changers at the special session at Delhi to permit the Swarajists to have their own way. This does not look like maintaining the stronghold of "discipline" on free thinking and free action. At Cocanada he had Maulana Shaukat Ali brought round most of the No-change stalwarts who could have easily defeated the Swarajists there, if not at Delhi also, to confirm the Delhi concession. Mahatma Gandhi, when he was at last fit to take part in our national deliberations, did seek to restore discipline at the A.I.C.C. meeting at Ahmedabad, against the advice of some of the staunchest No-changers. But before the meetings concluded he gave up the attempt in the frankest fashion, and followed it up soon after his second convalescence in November with the Calcutta "Pact" which was still greater concession than that of Delhi or Cocanada. And

now he has absolved the Swarajists, a wing of whom has persistently opposed the spinning franchise, and few of whom could be said to have helped the Mahatma in popularising spinning, from their honourable obligation undertaken at Calcutta. Is this the manifestation of thought-crushing discipline as the Lalaji would have us believe, or is it, on the contrary, the manifestation of a graceful generosity unknown in Western politics, and of which Lalaji at least is wholly incapable? Any stick is good enough to beat the Mahatma with, and Lalaji, who is evidently as incapable of appreciating such generosity on the part of the Mahatma as he is incapable of initiating it, adds this graceful act of the generous Mahatma also to the score he has long been keeping of the Mahatma's "failures" and of the experiments he has tried and then abandoned. Concession after concession to human weakness is to Lalaji—who writes as if he was in no way responsible for them, though he certainly was as much responsible as any other co-worker of the Mahatma—an experiment tried in a hurry, and abandoned in a hurry, all because the mad and impatient and unthinking Mahatma would neither take time himself to study things and to think nor give time to others. But the leader of the Swarajists is not incapable of appreciating such unexampled generosity in a political leader who differs in such vital matters from another political leader and yet surrenders so gracefully to the latter and to his party. Pandit Motilal Nehru, from whom too we greatly differ, has evidently been touched by the future. The Swarajists,—except perhaps those of the Deshmukh and Moonje and Kelkar type,—may sooner or later come round, but what hope is there for the Lalaji's following in the Punjab which knows no discipline except that of the Sangathan and the Hindu Mahasabha, flavoured by that of Arya Samajism? In Lalaji's province the Hindus and the Muslims exist only to try to defeat each other, and for Lalaji, the leader of the Punjab—without prejudice to his All-India Leadership to talk of a discipline that "strangles free thought and stifles and discussion" is for a rebel to talk of the rigours of loyalty!

LALAJI'S ABHORRENCE OF RELIGION IN POLITICS

A paragraph or two about Lalaji's abhorrence of religion in Non-co-operation politics and what we have done. The Lalaji does not tell us where religion has come in, but we think we can guess. The religion which must not enter politics is in particular the religion of the Muslims. His first objection is to the respect shown by the Mahatma and those who followed him for the religious obligations of the Muslims in the matter of Khilafat. Now, for all the help that Lalaji and the likes of his have rendered to the Khilafat cause, it may not have been rendered at all. All honour to the many Hindus who helped the Muslims in their hour of need and no Muslim should forget the debt he owes, in particular, to Mahatma Gandhi, though we regret to have to say that only too many acted at Kohat and elsewhere as if that debt did not exist, or had been wiped away. But let Lalaji remember that even if the Mahatmaji had not come so generously and warm-heartedly to Muslim help, the Muslims, or rather such of them as really took it up, would not have given up the Khilafat cause. Moreover, it was principally the Khilafat movement that vitalized the Congress and led to Non-co-operation. The Punjab wrongs are still unredressed, but far fewer Punjabis seem to have remembered them during the last two years than the Muslims who remember even to-day the unredeemed Jazeerat-ul-Arab. There is an undying vitality in the cause as long as there is any vitality in Islam, but there seems to be far less vitality in the cause of redressing Punjab wrongs mainly because in the Punjab more than in other Provinces there is less desire to have common wrongs redressed than communal wrongs, real and fancied, and this in its turn is due to the leadership of Punjab's Hindu and Muslim leaders, including the Lalaji himself. But we are perhaps digressing. The question is, could or could not the Congress, while claiming to be National and Indian ignore the betrayal of Indian Muslims by Britain in the treaty she was imposing on the *Sangathan* of Islam known as the Khilafat ? Muslim loyalty to Britain was conditional on Britain's respecting every religious obligation of the Muslim, just as we believe Hindu loyalty is con-

ditional on her respecting every religious obligation of a Hindu. And the freedom of the Jazeerat-ul-Arab from non-Muslim control, and the maintenance of the requisite degree of the temporal power of the Khilafat for guarding Islam's borders and for enforcing Islamic discipline within them had always been two of the principle religious obligations of the Muslims of the world. Largely with Indian and Muslim aid, Britain had compelled the Turks to accept the armistice. India and the Muslims should have been called to make the peace just as they had been called to wage the war. The Muslims of India could not consent to the transfer of their Holy Land to non-Muslim control, to the destruction of the temporal power of the Khilafat and to the reduction of the Khilafat to the position of a petty Emir controlled in every direction by the enemies of Islam, and living on the sufferance of Christian Powers. As the present writer said, addressing Mahatma Gandhi at the Amritsar Khilafat Conference, held immediately after his (the author's) release and his brother's in the last days of 1919, Indian Muslims had no use for the citizenship of the Empire if it was to be at the sacrifice of the Khilafat and of the freedom of Islam's Holy Land, and, in fact, of everything that they held dearer than life itself. Could India co-operate with her foreign rulers after the betrayal of seventy millions of her second largest community ? The Mahatma said "no," but it is evident now that Lala Lajpat Rai would have liked to say "yes," though, characteristically enough, he did not when he had every opportunity of saying it.

ISLAM OR "PAN-ISLAMISM"

Well, he can say "yes", even now, but if he can attract one honest Muslim to his "National" Congress after that we are very much mistaken. These are the terms on which alone a Muslim can agree to be a member of any nation. Men like Lalaji and that inveterate enemy of "Pan-Islamism," Mr. Bepin Chander Pal, may not like these terms, and to many other Hindus too they may seem very peculiar terms, just as to Muslims and Christians and others whose idea of religion is that of a Universal Religion,

the idea of Hinduism, the religion of the inhabitants of Hindustan, is a peculiar idea. But we must take things as we find them, and Muslim co-operation in an Indian nationality can only be had on terms we have mentioned. Lalaji and those who think with him and take it or have it, we cannot alter the terms, for what our ill-informed critics call Pan-Islamism is nothing more and nothing less than Islam itself, the supernational *Sangathan* of Muslims in five continents. To the Lalaji a larger share in the administration of community, or the development of India's industries and other such things, may mean Swaraj. To us, for Hindus, no less than for Muslims, Swaraj is nothing if it does not include *Swadharma*.

AN UNDELIVERED LETTER

1925

The following letter has somehow found its way into the editorial office of the *Comrade*, and we would like to share it with our readers. We cannot say whether it was ever posted. It has certainly not been delivered to the addressee, and he should thank us that by its publication he is at least enabled to read its contents, though he shares that reading with the rest of the world. Perhaps he has by now acquired enough toleration to put up with so much of "communism." For our readers' convenience we have inserted cross-headings in the body of this letter. Otherwise it is published exactly as it reached us.

XI

AN UNDELIVERED LETTER

My dear Algernon,

So you are sending Wood to us. Shade of Montagu: What would he not say about the "Wooden" character of India's Government with a Wood at the top of it? I ought to be "true to salt"—a cardinal virtue in the East—and should not confess the contempt I feel for the men of this country whose salt I eat; but I must tell the truth also sometime, and I know it is safe enough if I whisper it into your private ear. Even a century and a half after our rule these poor deluded fools deceive themselves every five years with the hope that the incoming Viceroy will bring with him the charter of their liberties.

THE ADVENT OF MORLEY. "SOME" CHANGE FROM LORD GEORGE HAMILTON

What expectations did they not have when the Liberals swept the board in 1906, when I had only been a few years in the country, and it was announced that Morley, who could have had any place in the Cabinet, chose the Indian Secretaryship of State. "Some" change that from dear old Lord George Hamilton. My dear Algernon, we in India can never forgive Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the greatest of Imperialists, and, in fact, the founder of Imperialism though he was, for when he pressed upon Balfour the philosophy of doubt, his doctrine of Protection and Imperial Preference and split up the Unionist Party, he forced many Unionist Ministers to resign, and among them our Lord George. How true was *Punch's* description of this Lord of the destiny of "India's teeming millions,"—a phrase no native orator can resist. *Punch* then wrote that it was his resignation along with some of

his Unionist colleagues that brought to most Englishmen the first information that he too was a Minister of the Crown:

JOURNALISM AND OFFICE

It was idle to expect the biographer of English and foreign men of letters and men of action, philosophers and statesmen of such varied attainments as Voltaire and Cromwell, Rousseau and Cobden, Diderot and the other encyclopædists of France and Burke, Walpole and Gladstone, to be content with chronicling history and not make it himself.

A journalist is a jack of all trades, and, as you know, we English distrust this versatility too much to make him the master of any trade, and particularly of the trade of politics in our parliamentary life. Let him comment and criticise as much as he likes the legislators of his land, but let him not attempt himself to make its laws. We rather like criticism, even in this country, and so long as it stops there and leads to no action on the part of those who indulge in it or admire it, we do not mind how violent it is. Its violence then betrays only the importance of the critics, and, to tell you the truth, it rather tickles our sense of our own power. Unlike our neighbours across the Channel, who have just displaced so self-willed a general as the free-thinking lover of laicity, Sarrail, the darling of the Grand Orient Lodge of Masonry, by De Jouvenel, the Editor and Proprietor of *Le Matin*, we do not make our leader-writers our leaders, and generally contrive to keep the editors of our newspapers in their editorial sanctums. We certainly do not permit them to stray from the haunts of the members of the Fourth Estate into the penetralia of "office" consecrated to the two other Estates, the two which also keep the conscience of the First or Kingly Estate. With us Fleet Street does not lead to Whitehall.

MORLEY'S CHOICE

But Morley, who was as much at home in the editorial chair

of the said Fortnightly as of the nimble *Pall Mall Gazette*, was not a scribbler of journalese who could merely write at top speed on all topics, but a historian and a philosopher who could also think. He was not lavish with the current coin of the realm like other journalists who have a command of language, but a litterateur who was himself the coiner of new-minted phrases which he put into philosophical, literary and political circulation. Englishmen distrusted him sufficiently to keep him twice out of Parliament; but when he forced his way into St. Stephen's at the third attempt, Morley revenged himself amply on his mistrusting fellow-countrymen by making a jump almost straight from journalism to the Treasury Front Bench, and boldly accepted, and even claimed for his aureole, the fierce light that used to beat in those stirring days and nights,—for all-night sittings were then common at St. Stephen's—upon one particular seat, *viz.*, that occupied by the Irish Chief Secretary. The man who could be chosen for that "ever vex'd Bermuthes" of British politics, and accept that "distressful country," Ireland, as his first job, certainly did not choose this other "distressful country." India, out of all the jobs that were his for the asking to rust in the inglorious case of Lord George Hamilton. That was plain as a pikestaff, and the "Elder Statesmen" here who lick us young cubs into shape in the "District" Clubs, and take charge in the United Service Club of the lucky ones among us whose talents as essay-writers, encouraged by the Dons of Oxford, take them to the Secretariats of the Provincial and Imperial Governments, were heard to swear with the energy that characterises them rather than the solemn dignity that one associates with the title of "Elder Statesmen."

PRINCIPAL AND AGENT

Morley was masterful, and as "Honest John" he had "the principles of a lifetime" hanging like so many millstones round his neck. What was worse, one or two of our own Service turned traitors and sought to give him a deep-sea burial with all those millstones of philosophical Radicalism to prevent his resurgence.

In that young hopeful of the Jewry, Montagu – how that name, characteristic of the aristrocracy of Christendom, contrasts with the Ghetto—Morley had an apt pupil-teacher who sought to teach us that the Viceroy in Calcutta and Simla was but the agent, and that the man whom we in the days of Lord George Hamilton thought we had effectively buried from all time in King Charles Street, Whitehall, was the principal. It was hard to accept this doctrine of principal and agent, and we should have liked to have had a Curzon instead of a Minto to take up cudgels on behalf of the Viceroy, as he would have thought, but in reality to take up cudgels on our behalf. But, alas, even a Broderick had caused him to be supplanted—though not subdued—through Kitchener's instrumentality and it was strange turn of fortune that the man whom we could have expected to champion our cause found it necessary fifteen years later to snub the Jew in Whitehall and the Jew at Simla by calling us a "subordinate branch of the British Government."

We were the last people to command the patience and the pliability of the East that is supposed by the poet to bow low before the blast in patient deep disdain, and to raise its head again when the storm has blown over. But what else could we do? We therefore summoned such patience as we could, and put up with Morley's taunts against the "Tchinovniks." Had he only railed at us we could have borne it better, and could have also opposed him more effectively. But he did not rail. He ridiculed, and, my dear Algenon, I must confess we have not yet schooled ourselves to bear that. His sarcasm seemed to choke us. Well, he got his Reforms, but at the cast of his translation to the Upper House which his Party had set out to end if they could not mend it. Our "agent," the ex-Viceroy, presented a too solid phalanx of immutability in the Lords, and "Honest John" had to become the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Morley of Blackburn, ostensibly to seek some rest from the Ramsay Macdonalds, the Smeatons and the Henry Cottons of the Commons, but really to pilot his Reform Bill in the perilous seas that, thanks to us, than rushed through the House of Peers. What is generally as still as a glassy lake became at our bidding as tem-

pestuous as the straits between Scylla and Charybdis which Ulysses had to navigate.

THE MORLEY-MINTO REFORMS

But what of the Reforms? The natives and our critics at Home got only the shadow but it was we that retained the substance. Even Morley the Radical, was so frightened by us that he refused to part with the majority of the solid official bloc in the Imperial Legislature, and even though the natives were in the majority in the provincial "Parliaments," we arranged the franchises in such a way that we were just as safe there as in the Imperial Legislative Council itself. And you could trust the Hindus and the Muslims to quarrel over the "spoils."

It was not the Legislatures that we minded much, though you may be sure we shrieked and wailed just the same about them. What we really minded was the admission of the natives into the Holy of Holies where the ark of the Covenanted Services' covenant was kept. McDonnel, the Irish Governor of the "Disunited" Provinces, whom you may remember in connection with the trouble he gave over Wyndham's scheme of Devolution, in his own country, had gladened the hearts of the champions of a Hindu language called Hindi, and had been hailed by them as the herald of the Home Rule down in India for whom they sought an extension beyond his gubernatorial lustrum, to the great chagrin of the other members of our Service and his, and of the Muslims who were then loyal to us. Well, he upset all their apple-carts when in vindicating the privileges of the Service be denounced Morley for the sacrilege of admitting natives into the Executive Councils of India and into the India Council of the Advisers of the Secretary of State. And the irony of it was that in railing at "the arm-chair philosopher who only knew men from books" and yet presumed to lecture experienced administrators on their failings as administrators, McDonnel talked of having "played on the harp the strings of which are the hearts of men"—the very men whom he was so anxious to shut out from office!

SUCCESS SNATCHED OUT OF FAILURE

He did not succeed ; but that is not to say we too did not. Why, we have kept all the gentiles in the outer court so far as power is concerned, and as for knowledge, our imperial arcana are no longer committed to paper and pen, but pass from "breast to breast" as the natives say. In any case they are as safe as the secrets of Free-masonry, for self-interest attaches to us those we raise to "power", and every high office thrown open to the natives is one more link in the chain binding them to our rule. But, pray, do not think we have triumphed by trickery. Much as Morely despised us, we worked our way even to his intellect. He could not suspect every Civilian and every man of every Service. Little indeed did this arm-chair administrator know the solidarity of the Services. Every Qui-Hai that met Morely—and those that were most "sympathetic" to native aspirations more than the rest—squirted into that absorbing brain of his just a tiny drop of poison or antidote—it all depends upon the point of view—and every ickle made a mickle. Moreover, scratch the most Radical Briton and you will find a Die-hard Tory under his skin. It is this saving grace of our National Conservatism that has so often come to our rescue in India. Morely could not leap that five-barred gate of national prejudices over which even Montagu came a cropper. In Montagu's case it was not heredity : but in his acquisitiveness the Jew could not escape acquiring some of our graces as well as other gains. Labour's after all ours, blood, bone and all, and the Scotch MacDonald has proved even more retentive of our national rights than the Hebrew Montagu. Morley refused to go further than we would let him, and he declared with all the emphasis of a doctrinaire's dogma that as far as his vision could go India would always need an autocracy for her governance. *Quod erat faciendum,* as Euclid would say. Little did he dream when he made that momentous and fateful declaration that it was not his vision but ours, and that he was seeing only that which we wanted him to see. Thus was success easily snatched out of apparent failure. And here endeth the first lesson. But thank heavens, the "educated classes" of India, our best allies

to-day,—because our best instruments and our easiest mediums,—have not learnt even that lesson yet.

MONTAGU'S ADVENT AND THE MAN ON THE SPOT

They certainly had not learnt it when Montagu, burning to make history, was won over by the Welsh Wizard and the Coalition and deserted his chief, Asquith, during a crisis in the War. There was great jubilation among the natives when Montagu himself became the "principal." But the "agent" was our agent, and not his, and although he made history sure enough when the new Reforms supplanted those of the Morley-Minto period ten years later, we saw to it once more that we should retain the substance, and only the shadow should go to our opponents.

Montagu was the first Secretary of State who had visited "India's coral strand" before taking charge of the India Office, and he imagined that would count in his favour. But we had forestalled him, for we had seen to it that Hardinge should be succeeded by a "Man on the Spot." Hardinge had begun as badly as he could by modifying the Partition of Bengal and inaugurating a new era, the era of Hardinge's Hegira or flight from Calcutta to Delhi. But before he departed he made his peace with the Civil Service. Coriolanus may have been ashamed to cadge for votes by showing his wounds to the populace of Rome ; but we made full use of Hardinge's wounds at the time of his State entry into the New-Old Capital and succeeded in enacting soon after our own brand of Conspiracy Law, neither wholly English nor wholly Indian, but altogether "Anglo-Indian" (Old Style). That bomb thrown from a Chandni Chawk balcony came in handy and, my dear Algernon, if your brother officer, Guy Fleetwood Wilson, as the Second in Command failed to rise to the height of the occasion, or did not, for Louis Dane, Governor of the Punjab, told the assembled natives in the Durbar at which Hardinge was to have presided how Englishmen were determined to rule them. Lawrence's choice of the sword and the pen frankly offered to the natives in his day, to which

they now object by going to the length of damaging his statue, was far too generous. Dane would give no such choice, and how could he ? We rule by both, and the Pen of the Civil Service and the Sword of the Army are the two heraldic supports of our rule. But I must not digress. To revert to Hardinge, as I said before, he made his peace in the end ; though I wonder whether his native counsellors who thought they had him in their pocket when he was apparently fighting Craddock and the Civil Service even then realized that he had them all the time in this pocket !

But we decided that it would not do to take the risk of another Hardinge, and the "Mess-pot" mess gave us our chance. At Home they wanted to prove that it was we who had failed there. But we, the Civilians, were not going to be saddled with any responsibility for War failures and threw the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief to the Parliamentary and Press wolves at Home. Nay, we carried the War into the enemy's country and blamed the native agitators and their supporters at Home who were always clamouring for economy. A cheeseparing policy where the Army was concerned was bound, so we protested, to result in the "Mess-pot" mess. As the War was proceeding none too well, we asked for a Viceroy who would know more about war than a diplomat like Hardinge. But we were careful not to ask for a real warrior like "Kay of Kay" whom King Edward was for sending out, but whom Morley would not have. We therefore chose a safe enough man, a Captain of the "Terriers" who was living at Jutogh next door to us at Simla. No lion like Kitchener but the same family—a tame domestic cat. When we had practically settled everything with the coalition, the poor fellow was called back Home for a final inspection. And, do you know, my dear Algernon, when he was a guest of the Bombay Governor's for a day or two before the Homeward voyage, one of our fellows, who sat next to him at the Government House lunch, asked him why he did not try for the Military Secretary's job or the A.D.C. with the Governor. He was not after all far too modest when he replied that they were doing something for him at Home to fix him up in a Covernment House in India, for he knew that if he was to reign

as Viceroy, it were we that were to rule.

THE MONTFORD MEANDERINGS

When Montagu came out to India to give the natives another dose of Reforms, we arranged that the dose was to be only homoeopathic. Wellington could not have given to the troops under him at the Waterloo order "Up, Guards, and at them!" with the greater assurance than we did when he asked the ex-Captain of the Territorials to be up and at Montagu. Throughout Montagu's meanderings in India, he was clearly the "second fiddle," our "Man on the Spot" was the genius loci that presided. And not for a minute was Montagu left alone to palaver with the natives Wherever he would go, Chelmsford would go with him. In fact, it was not Montagu that was touring India, nor Chelmsford, but "Montford." My dear Algernon, sometime the thing needed an amount of audacity that we feared the fellow could not command. But it had to be done, and even if Montagu had accepted the offer of a day's sand-grouse shooting in a native State and was on the point of motoring off with the native Prince, our "Man on the Spot" would jump in the car just as it was moving off and the native Prince would of course express his gratefulness for such gracious acceptance of his hospitality by the First Gentleman in all Asia: Once the natives gave Montagu a regular full dress banquet! but they had at the last moment to wire for a Taluqdar's Durbar tent from Oudh, as we saw to it that no Government building was available for such non-official feasting, and I believe it was the native Member of Government that had to find room in the grounds of his house for the canvas "Banqueting Hall" being erected!

DYARCHY, "MONARCHY" AND DYERARCHY

When it came to writing the Report, it was our fellows, the Marrises and the Slys, that took charge of it, and the dual character of the Montford activities was reflected in the dual

character of Dyarchy in which they were made to result. But the character of Dyarchy itself was not so much "Montford" as "Chelmstagu."

It was not really Dyarchy, but "Monarchy" right enough. So long as the M.P.'s of India did what we wanted them to do, they had full liberty to do it. Such was their latest Magna Carta. But the minute they did what they wanted to do, a stroke of the Viceregal or Gubernatorial pen was to make it of no avail, and we could lecture them into the bargain on their political incapacity and threaten them with taking the "power" we had so generously given to them at the end of the ten years' probation. Before we conceded even this, there was an unprecedented native agitation, and although we knew what we were going to concede to it, we took good care not to concede to it all at once. Dyarchy was therefore preceded by Dyerarchy. Of course, we talked as much about not holding a parley with rebellion nor shaking hands with murder as you with your Black and-Tans did at Home a year or two later in connection with Ireland. But whereas you have given Ireland a "Free" State that is not free, we have denied India even the name of freedom. We arranged for a Royal Amnesty, but we knew that it could not keep the chief rebels absolved for long. In the meantime the Committees we had set up to deal with the Reforms were acting as many Second Chambers for revising the Reforms and delaying them.

DYER'S FOLLY AND ITS RESULT

But our Reforms had more bone than meat, and my dear fellow, they have served us better than even we had imagined. As if the quarrels of Hindu and Muslim were not enough, we had now the dogs of Liberalism and Nationalism quarrelling over the bone of Reforms. Were they to be worked or not to be worked? Hamlet—you remember Goethe's simile of an oak planted in a flower-pot—did not take longer over his famous soliloquy: "To be, or not to be, that is the question," than the Congresswallas did at Amritsar. Had it been anywhere else that they sat to discuss this knotty problem, they would not only

have racked their brains but would have broken each other's heads over it. But at Amritsar they could not quarrel so soon after the blood of the "martyrs,"—as they called the rebels caught like mice in a trap—had been commingled in the soil of Jallianwalla Bagh. My dear Algernon, I know I am preaching to the converted when I say that Dyer's folly proved to the hilt that a soldier must never be allowed to do things off his own bat. Even in France the follies of Lyautey and Sarrail have at last taught them that our British way of trusting things to the Civilian is better. O'Dwyer won the War for England and Dyer almost lost us India. Don't think I am blaming him for teaching the natives a lesson. I would not have him alter the smallest detail if the thing has to be done again. But why the deuce must he go and make a boast of it before the Hunter Committee? It was only a Committee of our own appointing, and not a Popish priest's confessional. It may or may not be true that "the king can do wrong." But, at any rate, none of his servants should ever own he has done one. None of O'Dwyer's skill could help us to get over Dyer's silly bragging. Even worm turns, and at Gandhi's bidding the trodden worm of the Punjab did turn. No, within a mile of Jallianwalla Bagh and Crawling Lane you couldn't make even the natives divide over the Reforms. Those that are always ready to work the most unworkable scheme of things at our bidding had already given us pledges to work as Ministers. (Most of them would have almost as easily worked at our bidding as menials, but the title of Ministers tickled their native fancy.) As for the rest, instead of coming to blows as at Surat, they agreed in the end to call the Reforms unsatisfactory and disappointing, but to work them so far as they could be worked. This was to be "Responsive Co-operation."

TILAK : CO-OPERATION OR THE SECOND CAWNPORE ?

Now when a native agrees to "Responsive Co-operation," you may take it that he would agree to "Co operation," pure and simple, which is the co-operation between a slave and a slave-

driver. But there were two factors, or rather three, that made a difference. One was Tilak, who was not the slave of nomenclature, nor stood too long on his dignity when he could serve his cause. He had come back to the Congress after a little hesitancy and some negotiations as a concession to "dignity" and had become a greater power in the body than before his long incarceration. Gokhale was the "Mild Hindu" compared to his astute and determined political successor of the Peshwas, and his passing away soon after Tilak's release was symbolic of the new forces that were for a time to lead India. When Tilak said "Responsive Co-operation," you may be sure it would not be Co-operation, but the Fifth Maratha War, or at least a Second Cawnpore. That was the first factor of importance.

GANDHI'S RESPONSE

The second was Gandhi, and when he said "Responsive Co-operation" it had to be "Responsive" as well as "Co-operation." So, when Finlay in the Lords interprered more correctly than the Ministers in the Commons the English view of Amritsar, and the *Morning Post* gathered the shackles for Dyer with absolute ease to compensate the scapegoat of the Cabinet, Gandhi knew to what exactly he had to respond.

ALIS IN DREAMLAND : MEN OF TWO WORLDS

The third factor was contributed by those Siamese twins, the Ali Brothers who, like, "Sir Ali Baba, K.C.B's" Simla Archdeacan, are men of two worlds. Only too much at home in this, they have a foot each firmly planted in the next. They claim a kingdom in each world, and what is worse, even when we in Simla may satisfy them, they are not content, but want you also in Whitehall to do their bidding. This combination of Nationalism with Pan-Islamism it was impossible to satisfy without our Empire splintering in doom and our shrinking into measly-looking Little Englanders. They raised the cry of the Khilafat and brought the

Muslims into the Congress a whole generation after Syed Ahmed's separation. Right down to my own Oxford days the thing used to be spelt "Caliphate" and was felt to be as remote from any relevance to our affairs as the Abbasids and the Omayyads, and almost as dead and extinct as the Dodo. We thought that fellow Hulaku had killed it "for ever and ever"; but what are you to do with fellows who go even further than that and say it had been killed at Kerbala twice as long ago, but that it must be revived to-day as it was part of their faith, simply because for thirty short years it had lived on this earth and for thirteen hundred years in dreamland? Lewis Carrol has made a beautiful classic of his "Alice in Wonderland"; but what is one to do with these irrepressible "Alis in Dreamland" who insist on 'dreaming in day-time' and yet are far too substantial to be disposed of as indulging in day-dreams? We had done what we could in the days of our D. O. R. A., but these Jacks-in-the-box are up again the moment the lid is lifted. They acclaim both Tilak and Gandhi as their Gurus; and one may deal with Tilak and one may deal with Gandhi; but how is one to deal with a strange combination of the two? Gandhi went to gaol too much like Jesus going to Calvary, silent and even all smiles, for the thing to be crowed over or easily forgotten. It made us horribly uncomfortable. Tilak was even oftener enough in the dock, and once appeared in the strange role of a plaintiff in a civil suit, at Home, as you must have seen. But he too was a lawyer though he did not practise, and respected the bench even though he defied the law. These ruffians, however, turned the law-court into a playhouse where a farce is staged, and yet drew tears as easily as they raised a laugh. They profess Non-violence, not as a creed, like their Guru Gandhi, but as a policy. It is not, however, easy to take for granted the Non-violence of a giant measuring seven by five, and one fears even when submitting to force, maybe they would do it not like Christ at Calvary, but like their own Husain at Kerbala who died with his seventy odd followers pitted against thousands, but sword in hand.

Well, these living pictures of Violence by some strange magic captured that apostle of Ahimsa, Gandhi, and with our response

to the cry of the Caliphate given at Sevres and our response to the cry of Jallianwalla given in the Gilded Chamber at St. Stephen's, we had turned the "Responsive Co-operation" of Amritsar into the Triple Alliance of Tilak, Gandhi and the Ali Brothers culminating in non-co-operation.

TILAK'S DEATH AND THE WAR OF SUCCESSION

Fortunately for us Tilak died the same day as Non-co-operation was born, and we have not failed to profit by the war of succession that was inevitable among these native agitators. Could the Maharashtra, Nagpur and Berar allow a Kathiawari Banya to succeed a Chitpavan Brahmin of Poona as the leader of the Nationalists? For a time Maharashtra was submerged by the flood of Gandhi's ascendancy. Beaten at Calcutta along with Bengal—minus its imported Banyas from Marwar—it bided its time. At Nagpur, Bengal too went under, and it still held its breath. But with two Gujratis to murmur against Gandhi,—one of them our "Speaker" in foreign wig and Khaddar gown—Maharashtra revived, and when the highwater mark of Gandhism was reached at Ahmedabad, we knew that the tide would soon begin to turn.

THE MACHINE WITH PERPETUAL MOTION

Chelmsford was our choice, and you think he failed and we failed, and that it was Reading of the brief bag and the Marconi scrip who had out Yankeed the Yankees during the financial stringency of the War that has saved India to the Empire. My dear Algernon, I am surprised that you, a permanent official of the Home Civil Service, who know that Ministers may come and Ministers may go, but you go on for ever, should make such a mistake. You are the humble grass that bends when the storm sweeps amain, and are in this respect more like the East as the poet painted it bowing low before the blast with its patient deep disdain than we who are sojourning in the East. You know how

to survive a storm that rises even our British oak! Do you really think so low of a bureaucracy as to believe it can fail? Why, even more than Papacy in its struggle against the Empire, it is bound to win, for if Papacy knew no minorities a bureaucracy has no successions and knows no changes. "The King is dead: Long live the King" is a fiction of the Lawyers' creation. With us there is no King that can die, but a continuous Governance, soulless as a machine, in Morley's phrase, if you will, but a machine that has discovered and is applying to itself the secret of perpetual motion.

WHO DEFEATED GANDHI-ISM

Reading's five years are soon to be over, and Wood would soon be here. *Do mortuis nil nisi bonum* is the law of the West, where the sun sinks, and in the East the rising sun is worshipped by the multitude. We whose sun shines at midnight with the same brightness as at noonday do not grudge Reading his epitaph or Wood his prologue of praise. We need neither, for death has no sting for us, and we have long forgotten our nativity. We are, so to speak, without beginning and without end. It is enough that we live. Let those who die and those that are born after them have all the praise, whether posthumous or "prehumous." But since this letter is not an obituary notice full of lies that deceive none, but the private letter of one friend to another friend who have kept nothing from one another ever since they parted at the Portals of the Imperial Institute after the "One Competition," one to take up a few months later a post in the Home Civil Service—and the other to qualify himself in a year more at Oxford for a career in India as an Indian Civil Servant, I cannot keep back the truth from you.

Know then that it was not the lawyer-financier who defeated Gandhi-ism, but we, the "Men on the Spot," who are believed by the stay-at-Home "Men in the Street" to have come within an inch of losting India!

MAHATMA GOES TO THE MOUNTAIN

And it was in this wise. When the Lord Chief Justice of England came out to India with his watchword of "Justice". we proposed him to continue his vocation and send felons no matter how powerful to His Majesty's prisons. But this man who pretended to believe in the doctrine, *Fiat Justitia Ruat Coelum*, feared and trembled. Vincent give him courage and secured the willing consent of his two native colleagues,—one Hindu and the other Muslim, who were at daggers drawn in public life, but made such a perfect team when pulling the State Coach—to the laying of the apostles of High Treason by the heel. But he could not do simple justice because he feared the heavens would fall. He consented afterwards to shut up those enfants terribles, the Ali Brothers, whose sermons on Non-violence could not come up to Simla's standard of a Sermon on the Mount. But in the province that was willing to lock them up a native and a Muslim held the portfolio of Justice, and though he was willing enough to arrest and bring to a trial two more Muslims as he had arrested and brought to trial one before, he wanted at least one Hindu also to slave over his tender Muslim conscience. But that Hindu was none other than Gandhi. When told that Gandhi's language was not violent, whereas these non-violent disciples of Gandhi at least used violent language in denouncing Government, this impartial would-be arrest of Hindu and Muslim alike asked what could be worse than calling Government "Satanic"? Was any one worse than Satan, the Prince of Darkness, the Father of all Evil? This logic of language was unanswerable and irrefutable. For the time, being we could do nothing and the Great Ornamental was allowed to pass his idle moments in a palaver with Gandhi whom we had arranged through our "mediums" to summon up to Simla heights. So the Mahatma came to the mountain, and we allowed him to go away, after six interviews lasting fifteen long hours, well pleased with the new Lord of India's Destiny.

THE CHANTICLEER OF THE CHELMSFORD CLUB CROWS TOO EARLY AND TOO LOUD

But the new Lord of India's Destiny wanted to give out to

the world that he had drawn the first blood in the duel of wits, and in arranging the stage for his crowing over a victory that had not yet been won even on points, I confess we mnde a big blunder. The chanticleer at the Chelmsford Club made the still greater mistake of crowing not only too early, but also too loud. He offended every one when he made it out that it was Gandhi who sought an interview with him, and when he told all India that in reply he had said that his address—the address of his child of the Ghetto—was well-known at Simla, and that when in due course Gandhi had "applied" for the interview he had graciously granted it. That was a terrible *faux pas*; but not so bad, for Gandhi could forgive. He followed it by making it out that on behalf of the Ali Brothers, Gandhi had promised a public apology if Government would only forego their prosecution. They had already been induced by Gandhi to express their regret to the public for having used expressions in some of their public utterances which some of their friends and fellow-workers thought were capable of bearing a meaning they did not intend, though for their own part they declared themselves to be willing to admit enev that. It could not have been easy for Gandhi to bring these unruly brothers to publish such a statement; but when they found that it was interpreted as their recantation for fear of the prison, they poured down vials of their wrath on the devoted head of the Viceroy. Apparently they did not believe that vengeance was the Lord's but claimed according to the law and the ethics of the Pentateuch a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye.

THE VICEROY'S VENDETTA

And then came our opportunity. The Viceroy was determined on a vendetta, and when at Karachi the Brothers preached that a Muslim could not kill a brother Muslim without making an eternal abode in Hell-fire, and the Muslims in the Indian army should obtain their discharge rather than attack the Turks at Angora, the Viceroy could claim a special dispensation for his pledge given to Gandhi. He had promised that mere sedition on Gandhi's part and his friends' and followers' would not be punish-

ed, if it was unattended by sermons preaching violence, for if mere sedition was to be punished, the author of the phrase "Satanic Government" was bound to be the first prison in the dock, which the Viceroy was afraid to make him. Asking Muslim soldiers to obtain their discharge rather than fight brother Muslims of Angora in aid of the Infidel Greeks was the very reverse of violence. But it served our purpose and the Viceroy's. It was not sedition either, but a quasi-mutiny of which Gandhi was not guilty. So we segregated the Muslims from the Hindus and the "Trial of the Seven Bishops" was held at Karachi and it was not our fault that the Brothers were not transported for life. It was the jury system that was to blame, for while offending the highest judicial officer of the semi-Province of Sind in the most aggravating manner, the Brothers had bound such a spell round the jury that even a Britisher and an employee of Government along with other Christian and Hindus declared to be "Not Guilty" of the more serious offences of conspiracy and causing a sort of mutiny in the army.

A SKILFUL SEQUENCE OF STATE TRIALS

With them safe behind the iron bars of the Karachi prison after the stormiest of State Trials, it was the easiest thing for us to lock up Gandhi and, as Lloyd George said, bury him for six years underground. Gandhi was there to quiet the people when the Ali Brothers were locked up. If Gandhi had been locked up first, the Ali Brothers may not have cared to quiet the people. In fact, they may not have remained quiet themselves. Now confess, my dear Algernon, that we managed the thing superbly. Was not the sequence of the State Trials skilful?

There was much excitement in the country, and things would have become very serious for us had there been none to check and control the people. But if the conflagration was likely to spread far and wide, we had also the fire engine near at hand. This was Gandhi with his Ahimsa or creed of non-violence, and we used him effectively enough when a fornight later Hindu and Muslim rowdies broke loose on the day the Prince of Wales landed in

India and assaulted the Parsees who were for the most part thoroughly loyal to us. This entente, too, was turned to our advantages for it bound the Parsees all the more to us and separated them still further from Hindus and Muslims.

Hindu leaders, following Gandhi's example, had publicly made the same declarations for which the Muslim leaders had been clapped into gaol. But segregation of the communities was our policy, and we refused to mix the religious and the national issues, though Hindus and Muslims then had made them one, to our intense anxiety and chagrin. We have since seen to it that leading Hindus should denounce Pan-Islamism as incompatible with Nationalism ; but I must not anticipate. We did not spare the Hindu leaders that had defied us during the Karachi trial. But we locked them up on another issue, and when the gates of different prisons finally closed over the Dases and the Nehrus, we had Gandhi alone left on our hands.

How we buried him alive and thereafter killed his movement is a story of yet more absorbing interest. I reserve it for my next, for this letter is already too long, and when I have related it, you will have to confess, even if you do it after the perusal of this very screed, my dear Algernon, that it is we who are the saviours of the Empire and not the Readings and the Woods you export to us every five years. As for the natives, who begin to scan the skies and to cast horoscopes when the new Viceroy is about to become visible in the Indian firmament, it is our advantage that they should still consider Viceroys and Cabinet Ministers to be the lords of their destiny. If they were to think that it is on us that everything depends, some at least among them would die of despair, for we are as changeless as destiny itself. Thank God, only a few yet think that man is man and master of his fate. When this truth dawns on more of them, then indeed will be time to talk of "Abdication" aad lament over "Lost Dominion." Until then, my dear Algernon, we are safe, and you are safe and I blow kisses over the seven seas to you and remain

Ever Yours,

GERALD

NATIONAL MUSLIM EDUCATION

Dissatisfied with the Muslim University at Aligarh, Mohamed Ali in 1921 founded a National Muslim University—Jamia Millia Islamia. In the following two articles published on January 23 and February 1, 1926, in the *Comrade* he discusses the various features of the University.

After briefly analysing the needs of the Muslim Community Mohamed Ali points out how best they could be met by a system of education which offers a working synthesis of temporal and spiritual values.

XII

NATIONAL MUSLIM EDUCATION

THE *Comrade* when it was first founded was intimately associated not only with Muslim politics but also with Muslim Education, and in fact, it set out to discuss everything that was connected with the progress of Indians in general and of the Muslims in particular. To-day also the *Comrade* has the same purpose in view, and if the universalisation of the *Charkha* is the immediate national need of to-day, it is not to be gainsaid that ultimately the greatest need of the Muslim community is national education, and the *Comrade* must not neglect it any longer. It has been sadly neglected by all Indian communities and it did not take one long to realise this during the consultations that took place at Belgaum between those that were particularly interested in it. But since the Muslims were the first under Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, fifty years ago, to rebel against official control of Education and the first to raise the banner of Non-co-operation in education, it is their duty to be the first in re-examining also the present situation of national education.

Let us, however, make one thing clear. Although all communities in India must equally give such direction to the education of their youth as would entitle it to be called national, and national education must be of a type distinct from that which is effected in the Government or aided institutions, each community must provide separately for the education of its youth, without, however, setting up religious texts, or excluding members of other communities, or imposing upon them compulsory religious instruction in the tenets of its faith. This must be so because each community has its own ideals and its own traditions unless it is done in institutions mainly intended for its own youth.

Taking, therefore, the need of communal education for granted, we desire our readers to concentrate their attention on

the peculiar needs of the Muslim community. To our mind the greatest need of Muslims is that they should be Muslims in the truest sense of the word, and for the purpose it is essential that we should not tolerate the lacerating distinction between temporal and spiritual things, nor encourage any differentiation of species among the Muslims such as the clergy and the laity. The evils from which Muslim society in this country was suffering had to be clearly understood, and remedies had to be devised therefor, and incorporated in schemes of studies. The goal that was always kept in view was to turn out from these institutions not only young men of culture according to modern standards, but true Muslims imbued with the spirit of Islam, and possessing enough knowledge of their religion to be able to stand by themselves as sufficiently independent units in the army of Islam's missionaries. It was felt that even cultured Muslims possessed so little knowledge of their faith that they were content to leave the entire subject of religion exclusively to the small circle of Ulama, and either neglect it themselves and make it no part of their own lives, or live in blind and unreasoning dependence on the dictation of one or more guides from this group of Ulama. This was neither good for themselves nor for the Ulama nor yet for Islam.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was an ultra-loyalist and an arch-heretic according to some people, and yet it was this ultra-loyalist that had raised the standard of revolt against the Government in education, and it was this "arch-heretic" who had based his dissent on no other ground than a Muslim's passionate attachment to his faith. Christian missionary colleges and schools in which non-Christian students were compelled to attend the Bible classes were, of course, *Anathema maranatha* to the Muslims. But Syed Ahmed Khan had no less aversion to the schools and colleges of a religiously neutral Government, and he attributed the backwardness of his co-religionists in Western education to their sound instincts and the cherished traditions of their past which would not tolerate a complete divorce between secular and religious education. It was his policy that the Government had felt itself compelled to pursue, and it was precisely this policy which made the Muslims keep aloof from its educational institutions. Seyd

Ahmed Khan not only correctly explained but vigorously justified this attitude of his co-religionists. But he was too practical a reformer to be content with railing at the evil without working at the same time for the good. He prepared a scheme of a University which was to provide for the youth of his community religious as well as secular education. Above all it was to create for young Muslims a centre with the true Islamic atmosphere so that its *alumni* would not merely be educated and cultured men, but educated and cultured Muslims. We are not concerned with many of his religious views, and it may as well be confessed that having come under the spell of Western science at a time when Europe had received a new secular evangel in Darwin's *Origin of Species* and the revolutionizing theory of evolution, and having been impressed so greatly by the progressiveness of Europe, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in his newly-awakened enthusiasm attributed to it an omniscience that even in the light of its marvellous developments must now be confessed to have been greatly exaggerated. With a Tacitus-like antithesis he had credited Europe with every good quality in which he had found his own people deficient; but for all this he never wavered for a moment in his belief in the eternal truth of Islam and in the capacity of the Muslims to rise to the highest pinnacle of human greatness. All that he wanted was to build a bridge that would connect his ancient faith with this new science, and the ideal that he placed before himself when framing his scheme of the Muslim University of the future is best expressed in his own words. "Science," he said, shall be in our right hand, and philosophy in our left, and on our head shall be the crown of "There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is His Apostle." Aligarh did produce a fine amalgam of the East and the West in many things; and in spite of its progress in Western science and literature it maintained the communal pride that often acted as an effective motive to right conduct on the part of its *alumni*. But it must be confessed that it furnished them with precious little equipment in the matter of their knowledge of their faith. They were progressive enough, and they were proud enough of their faith; but they were, alas, far too ignorant of it, and their pride in it did not therefore help them much in order to avoid repelling Muslim parents whose orthodoxy was

shocked by the militant nationalism of Sir Syed, and to attract their boys, he had passed a sort of Self-Denying Ordinance that not only his own religious books would not be taught in his college, but that he would not be a member of the Committee that regulated religious instructions. In this way a very colourless and really moribund Committee, which never did any work, prescribed perhaps once for all, some very elementary text-books in what was euphemistically called, "Theology." These text-books for the most part only prescribed rules for cermonial cleanliness and contained the ritual of prayers, or provided for the senior students some of the principal laws of Islam relating to marriage, dowry and divorce. The Quran practically remained a closed book to the students, xecept for the lectures of the late Maulana Shibli, which were, however, discontinued. The Traditions of the Prophet too were no more than a name; while only for a time some of the college classes read what shall be called a "Primer" dealing with the life of the Prophet, written by Maulana Shibli which did not extend beyond a score of pages in size. Of "Theology" in the sense of Dogmatics or Dialectics, there was no trace in any text-book. Ill-paid and neglected drones were generally employed in colleges and schools for teaching Arabic and Persian which were degraded to the position of "second language". And it was such dull-drones that were pitch-forked at Aligarh into the "Faculty of Theology" to teach his religion to the Muslim youth *once a week* in the hour consecrated on other days to "second language". The result was that the "Theology Hour" was even more enjoyable than the "Recreation Hour". What little information the text-book furnished could be crammed overnight and squirted out on the "Answer Book" in the examination hall next morning once or twice a year. There was no doubt a communal consciousness among the students, but it was far more secular than religious; and also they considered Islam to be the final message for the mankind and the only entirely true faith, and they could strenuously, and even intelligently enough, argue about the superiority of its chief tenets. They were shamefully ignorant of its teachings and of its world-wide and centuries-old history.

It was this state of affairs which the organisers of the Jamia Millia Islamia, or the National Muslim University of Aligarh set out to reform. For this purpose an intimate knowledge of the Holy Quran was considered an indispensable foundation. Therefore at every stage provision was made for an intelligent study of the Word of God. So that even those members of Muslim Society who, for various reasons, economic and other, were not able to continue their studies beyond the primary stage, should have read the Holy Quran, not only in the original Arabic, but also in the interlinear Urdu or other vernacular translation thereof. More than this, they insisted on the acquisition of some knowledge of the Arabic Language even in the primary stage of education, it being laid down, however, that a radical change must be made in teaching it. The present method of teaching, in which grammar obtrudes itself too much on the beginners' attention, has to be entirely discarded, and a more direct and natural method must be adopted if young children can be expected to acquire such knowledge of the Arabic Language as can be of practical use to them in understanding the Holy Quran.

The proposed plan was that soon after a child became familiar with the Arabic and Urdu characters, he should be taught the last few short chapters of the Quran not only in Arabic, but also in their Urdu or other vernacular translation, and that the prayers contained in *Namaz* should be taught in the same manner, so that even a child of seven would not offer his prayers without understanding what he was repeating. Similarly it was proposed that by the time a child finished his primary education approximately at the age of 12 or 13, and finished the *Quran-i-Sharif* in Arabic, he should also have finished its interlinear Urdu or other vernacular translation. This meant that he would not only finish at the age the reading of the Quran, as at present but also the *Nazira* reading of a fairly large-sized Urdu and other vernacular book which, however, would happen to be the translation of the Holy Quran.

But at this stage, as has already been stated, this much only was not considered to be enough. It was, therefore, proposed that in the last three years of the primary stage a boy should be

taught Arabic as he is often taught English at present. It is true that even with improved methods of teaching a child of ten is not likely to acquire in three years more than a very elementary knowledge of a foreign language. But it was hoped that, in addition to his elementary knowledge of Arabic, his reading of the Quran and its translation side by side for full five years or more would enable him to pick up at least so much of Arabic as would create in him an interest and fervour in reading his Scriptures with the assistance of the interlinear translation. It is this interest and fervour that was sought to be created, and it was feared that it could not be done by any method other than the one proposed in the scheme under reference.

In the secondary stage, which was to include as much education as is generally imported in the intermediate classes of present day colleges. The study of Arabic was made compulsory with the same object in view; and therefore it was proposed that in these five years, ending with the 17th year of a young man's life, the students should be taught the entire *Quran-i-Sharif* as the only text-book of Arabic, together with a number of select *Hadises*, and that at the same time they should learn Arabic as a living language so as to be able to speak and write it at least like intermediate students speaking and writing English at present. It was proposed that only so much grammar as was absolutely necessary should be taught and that the method of teaching it should be reversed, the student being made to deduce the rules of grammar inductively from several examples of the correct use of the Arabic language, rather than deductively to form correct sentences after first mastering the rules of grammar.

At this stage it was proposed to teach any other Arabic prose as in the first place the object was not so much the study of the language as attainment of an intimate knowledge of the *Quran-i-Sharif*, and in the next place, a study of Quran was thought ample at this stage even for the acquisition of a knowledge of the Language. Nevertheless it was proposed that a few hundred select verses should also be taught to familiarise the student with the Arabic poetry.

It was hoped that such a study of Quran as was proposed

would make a young man a far better Muslim, and would enable him to know his religion far more intimately than the study of Theology through other text-books, but it was not intended that other knowledge of Muslim Theology should not be imparted.

What was proposed in the primary stage was, firstly, practical instruction in Islamic Ritual imparted orally by the teacher, and secondly instruction by means of lessons with regard to the beliefs and commandments of Islam to be incorporated in the vernacular "Readers" which would include other instruction in Islamic history and elementary scientific information embodied in a popular form.

It was proposed to teach *Aqa'id, Fiqh* relating to *Ibadat, Akhlaq* and *Seerat* in this manner so that they could be easily assimilated by a growing child at an early stage. The religious instruction generally imparted at present seldom goes beyond elementary *Fiqh* relating to *Ibadat*, and that too is imparted it a manner which kills all interest for it in the student, and makes in a druggery. Instead of that it was proposed that lessons in the Urdu "Readers" should be skilfully prepared with requisite literary grace so that they could unobtrusively and almost imperceptibly familiarise a Muslim child with correct Muslim beliefs and with the main commandments of his faith, preferably with a short history of these commandments in order to explain their gradual development, and thus impress on the student their special need. These lessons were also to incorporate leading incidents from the *Seerat* of the Prophet and of his immediate successors, and from Islamic history, not only with a view to impart necessary and correct information on these subjects, but also with a view to impress upon the mind of a child that it was because Muslims outside this small circle will soon come to approximate to the clergy and the laity in other communities. Our decline is largely due to this departure from Islam as preached and practised in its earliest days, Islam without latter-day accretions and in all its pristine purity.

When the students of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan's College at Aligarh, in October 1920, resolved to respond to the call of Non-co-operation, and when on the refusal of the College authorities

to free the College from official control, they converted themselves into a Non-co-operating University, an opportunity was presented to those interested in Muslim education on truly Islamic and national lines to frame a scheme of studies for national Muslim educational institutions in India.) Before the task of devising a course of studies could be undertaken, special attention had to be paid to the main facts of the soundness of Islamic beliefs, the practical utility of Islamic commandments, and strict adherence to them in practice, that Muslims achieved their early successes, and that if we desire to retrieve our last prominence, it could only be done by adherence to Islamic convictions, and following the example of our Prophet and his immediate successors.

In the secondary stage, and also in the university stage, *Fiqh, Aqa'id* and *Seerat* were proposed to be taught as distinct subjects and not merely in the Urdu "Readers." But the lectures were to be oral, and it was proposed that, as far as possible, text-books should be avoided. Text-books were to be generally for the guidance of the teacher himself, so that the present-day stagnation might be remedied, and reliance on the original sources of authority rather than on latter-day compilations might be encouraged.

It would be manifest from all that has gone above that (a much greater emphasis was being laid on religious teaching than had ever been attempted in any national institution where secular instruction is also imparted.) But it was hoped that the method suggested would be an improvement upon that which was pursued for religious instructions even in institutions solely devoted to the study of Theology.

In the university stage, provision had been made for a school of Islamic studies, in which a young Muslim, who had acquired as much secular knowledge as is now obtained in colleges teaching up to the intermediate standard could pursue a study of *Tafsir, Hadis* and *Fiqh* with the *usool* of each of these, of *Aqa'id* and *Kalam* and of *Seerat*, and the History of Islam with requisite study of Geography, and at the end of this course, at the age of twenty or thereabouts, could be considered qualified to be a religious teacher or *Maulvi*, and at the same time be acknowledged to possess as much culture in the modern sense of the word as

any graduate of any European university. He could proceed thereafter to a doctorate for which a thesis on any subject included in any of the main heads of religious knowledge detailed above was to be required. (This would, it was thought, for the first time bring under one roof secular and religious learning with undoubted benefit to both, and remove that estrangement between the two which had resulted in sterilising religious learning and making secular learning soulless and godless.)

But even if the Jamia's scheme of religious studies along with secular instruction was to be its only departure, we ask educated and cultured Muslims, and the Ulama too, to say whether a university that intended to teach all this had still to justify its existence? We ask this question not in an academic sort of way, but we demand that if this scheme of studies is of any value to Indian Muslims, they should not merely tell us that they like it, but prove their liking for it by such a substantial help of the Jamia as would ensure its permanent existence even independently of the contributions from the Khilafat Fund. To our mind this form of education must now take precedence over all other existing forms. But even if the Muslims are not prepared to go so far as to substitute this scheme of education for the existing schemes, we still ask whether a community of seventy million Muslims cannot provide even 700 students to pursue the course of studies that we have outlined and the funds to enable them to do so. That is why we ask the Muslim public whether it approved of the scheme of studies or not and the answer, if favourable, must be more students, more scholarships, and more books for the library and not merely a tribute of praise in words.

Next to the religious aspect of education on which much greater stress has now been laid than ever before, it is to be emphasised that the absurd and slavish idea of imparting instructions in the various branches of knowledge through the refractory medium of a foreign language must be wholly discarded. (The study of English is to be retained as an optional subject in the secondary stage, and it is desirable that for some time to come a large number of school students should continue to learn that language from the age of thirteen. But it must be entirely re-

moved from the primary stage, and in no case must it be the medium of instruction, though it may for some time be necessary to retain European terminology in the case of certain branches of science.)

Permission must, however, be given to school students in the secondary stage to study any European languages. French and German would also be taught side by side with English in these secondary schools.

But the study of Asiatic languages is not to be neglected. In the first place the study of vernaculars, and of Hindi where Urdu is the vernacular, and of Urdu where Urdu is not the vernacular, though in view of the relative strength of the vernaculars at present and of our present need, for some time to come the degree should be awarded in the vernaculars in any subject approved by the university. This would encourage the preparation of new books which are greatly in demand, among others, for educational purposes.

Apart from the compulsory study of the vernaculars, and the use of the vernaculars as the medium of instruction in every stage, provision must be made for the study of an Asiatic, language other than one's own vernacular as an optional subject in schools. In the university stage provision must be made for degree in Arabic, Persian, (both language and literature) and as the reward of merely *linguistic* attainments in any *two* oriental languages other than Arabic, Persian and, of course, one's own vernacular.

(Since a foreign language is to be discarded as the medium of instruction, it is confidently expected that the students would both attain deeper knowledge and cover a larger surface of it in the same number of years than they do at present in the existing schools and colleges. Thus a student who has completed the primary school course should be expected to be sufficiently well grounded in the main essentials of Muslim Theology, (which would in itself be of very considerable cultural value, when taught in the manner proposed, as a subject of the greatest practical utility in this world also), to know a little Arabic so as to be able to read the Holy Quran with a relish and a fervour, to know Arithmetic for all practical purposes of life, and elementary practical

Geometry and Mensuration together with elementary book-keeping, which would help a village boy in his ordinary dealings in after-life ; to possess accurate and extended general information although of an elementary character, with regard to various sciences, to be acquainted with the outlines of the history of Islam and of India in their relationship with world movements ; with the Geography of India in considerable detail, and the Geography of Islamic countries generally in relationship with the rest of the world ; with outlines of the constitution of his country's Government and the administration of his district ; and to know generally his rights and duties as a citizen. At the end of this stage he should be able to read and write his vernacular with ease and should not altogether be at the mercy of the professional scribe for the purposes of petition—for writing or understanding the contents of such documents as he is ordinarily required to sign.

In the secondary stage he should be expected to be familiar with the teaching of his faith, and to possess intimate knowledge of the Quran in Arabic to read and appreciate the literature in his vernacular, and write it with lucidity and a degree of literary grace and to be able to read easy Persian and Hindi if the vernacular is Urdu, or read and write Urdu with ease if the vernacular is other than Urdu, and to have knowledge at least up-to the present Intermediate standard of any three of the following subjects :

Any European language or any Arabic language other than the vernacular, History (of India and Islam, and one more historical subject) Geography; Civics and Political Science, Economics; Natural Science (any three branches); Mathematics; Logic and Elementary Psychology and Drawing.

In the university stage, besides acquiring a further knowledge of his religion and acquainting himself with standard works of Theology, he should be required to take up any one branch or school of studies, History, Sociology, Philosophy, Mathematics, Science, Literature, or Law and to show therein proficiency up to the standard of the B.A., degree of European universities or of the M.A., degree of the present Indian universities.

It may also be explained that considerable modification must be made in the present division of the various stages of Education. It is not expected that many children in villages or belonging to the poorer classes in towns, would ordinarily proceed with their education after they have completed their twelfth year of age. And for a long time to come for at least 75 per cent of the population, whatever instruction is to be given to them, must be a complete unit in itself, though we should not set up any barrier for those who would proceed to the next stage of education. And since this age also corresponds with the natural change, childhood to youth, it should be a natural landmark in education as well. For the same reason the method of imparting instruction too should be different at this stage from the method to be adopted in the next stage. Here no division is made between knowledge of one subject and knowledge of another, and except Arithmetic, which cannot be taught in that manner, the idea is to teach every subject by means of reading lessons to be supplemented by oral instruction intended to bring home to the child the knowledge and the moral teaching contained in the daily lessons of the "Reader."

Such "Readers" will have to be prepared, and it is proposed that under the Chief Editorship of a competent educationist with an intimate knowledge of child psychology, and a considerable sense of literary style, a number of writers should be appointed for this purpose. *This is a task which alone entitles those who would undertake it to the liberal patronage of the entire community.* The essential general qualification for each of these writers should be the same as for the Chief Editor himself. But some will have to be those who specialise in science, while others will have to be religious teachers, and a third set will have to be students of Islamic and Indian History; and a fourth, students of literature, and so on. The various subjects to be included in these "Readers" should be allotted to the groups concerned, and the Chief Editor should, in consultation with them, fix the size of each "Reader," and the number of lessons for each, and allot to each subject the lesson thereon in each "Reader." In this way the entire ground of knowledge to be imparted to students in the primary stage should

be covered by the different groups of the writers in graduated lessons and the "Readers" should not be used merely to impart instruction in the vernacular but also to convey wide and accurate information which is the minimum necessary for a human being to possess, and which it is possible for a child of 12 to assimilate. The child should, therefore, be examined not merely in reading the vernacular text-books but also in its contents and subject-matter, including religion, science, history, geography, civics, etc.

The next stage would be that of secondary education, corresponding not to the present High School stage, but to the Intermediate Collegiate stage, to be finished like the Primary stage in 5 years, and approximately when the student has completed the 17th year of his age. In this stage the vernacular course should be intended to impart instruction merely in the vernacular language and literature. The other subjects should be taught as so many distinct subjects, and the "Reader" system of general instruction should be discarded here. It is intended that in the three years, which would correspond to the present Matriculation standard, a youth should take up any three subjects, in addition to the vernacular, Arabic and Theology. But in the final two years corresponding to the Intermediate, he should be required to take up only two optional subjects. It is not necessary to restrict his choice as much as is done at present. He should therefore be able to select only subjects for which he has a real aptitude. But apart from the opportunity accorded to him at this stage of selecting his own group of subjects, specialisation should not begin until he has reached the University stage.

In the primary stage he should have gathered necessary information on every important subject, though necessarily of an elementary character. But he should still have got enough of it to whet his appetite for more knowledge, requiring long and careful study if practical use is to be made of them. Thus the larger choice that is to be given to him in the secondary stage should not mean his complete ignorance of any subject, and yet more extended knowledge of those subjects for which he has a natural aptitude.

In the University stage the "Group" System should be

discarded altogether, or rather the grouping together of the subjects should be regulated under different 'schools' or branches of knowledge such as History, Philosophy, Mathematics, Science, Literature, Law, Sociology and, of course, Islamic studies. In exceptional cases permission might be accorded to a student to attend lectures, some in one school and some in another, and a diploma may be given at the end of his special course setting forth the subjects he has thus studied to the satisfaction of the teachers and examiners. But on the whole it is desirable that this system should be discouraged and a pass degree should be rare thing and not the rule as in the Indian universities to-day.

The method of imparting instruction in the University stage must also differ from the system of lectures in which the student should be taking down notes as the professor proceeds with his lecture, supplemented by a tutorial system in which the tutor should guide and regulate the private studies of the undergraduates, and offer suggestions rather than sit down, textbook in hand, to read and explain the text. That is why the present Intermediate stage has been included in the secondary stage to which it is far more nearly allied.

It has already been stated that approximately 75 per cent of the population would not for some time to come proceed beyond the primary stage as far as can be foreseen at present, and no more than 50 per cent, even if as many, would proceed beyond the secondary stage, which must, therefore, be a distinct and definite unit like primary education, without any artificial barrier being set up here either. (After completing 17 years of age, a young man who completed the school course (which should correspond to the present Intermediate standard) should be expected to rank as a man of culture even if he proceeds no further.) Those who have literary ambitions and the requisite leisure, or desire to pursue a literary vocation would proceed to the University stage. This should occupy another three years of a young man's life, and he should generally graduate when he has completed the age of 20. But graduation means not the attainment of the standard of the present Indian B.A. degree, but

of the honours B.A. of English Universities for still higher education, research and authorship and it ought to be possible to obtain that at the age of 22 or 23.

Thus it is evident that the time which should be taken to finish university education should be less than what is at present taken to obtain even the B.A. degree, while very considerable additions have been made to the attainments to be expected from a graduate, the least to be expected being the attainments of an M.A. of to-day. This is possible to do mainly through the adoption of the vernacular as the medium of instruction, and the pursuit of better methods of teaching.

(It is desired that Muslims should take more interest than they do at present in science) and with that object in view it is proposed to impart scientific information even in the primary stage to form the foundation of future educational superstructure. It is hoped that in the secondary stage too, special encouragement will be offered in the schools for the study of science and that a larger percentage of the university students would take their degree in science than they do at present.) But science requires expensive laboratories, and it is for the Muslim community to decide what it must do to provide for the study of this the most essential subject after religion.

In the teaching of History, the History of Islam as well as the History of India is to be included, and in the last two years of the secondary course another historical subject is to be selectedd, such as Ancient History of Greece, Rome, India or the Semitic races, a period of European or Asiatic History or the outlines of the constitutional History of England and in school of History for the degree similar provision is to be made for Islamic History. But it must be stated that one cannot be satisfied with the present methods of teaching History, as if various countries are entirely detached and unconnected units. Thts is a wrong and perverse method of teaching History, which has so far resulted in a narrowed outlook and much international jealousy. It is, therefore, proposed that whatever historical subjects he taught they should be taught in such a manner that true historical proportion and perspective may be retained.

For this purpose even in the primary stage some idea should be imparted to the student of large world movements from which the history of his own country and people cannot be legitimately detached. In subsequent stages, the outlines of World History, or the History of the Human Race, as distinguished from the History of different nations and countries, and particularly of different dynasties, must be taught. This need not, and in fact cannot, be done in any great detail. But without this large view it is to be apprehended that historical teaching would still further deteriorate, on account of very intense present-day patriotism. Mr. H. G. Wells' new History, although far from satisfactory, and in the case of Islam, grossly defective, is nevertheless a great pioneer work in History and his methods are certain to be followed by those who possess greater and more accurate knowledge of historical details.

With regard to teaching Mathematics in the Primary stage, the children's minds are at present only too frequently overloaded by setting to them for solution of Arithmetical problems of great length and complexity such as grown up men themselves are very seldom required to solve in practical life. Therefore, practice is to be strongly condemned of setting such complex and tedious problems, particularly in the "simplification" of vulgar fractions. They may be very good test of industry and patience, but they are more suitable for grown up youths than for small children. It is only by discarding this practice that it will be possible to proceed as fast as is desired, and teach a boy of 12 enough Arithmetic to enable him to solve simple problems in Rule of Three, Interest, Areas, etc., with which a village lad and even a town lad, for the matter of that, would have to deal every day in practical life. It is much better to cover large surface in shorter time than to be content with the child's complete mastery of a few rules, which leaves him ignorant of much that he will be called upon in after-life to show knowledge of while knowing much that he will have much need of in his daily dealings with people.

We should also abandon the practice of making the study of Mathematics other than Arithmetic and elementary Mensuration

compulsory. The great educational value of Algebra and Geometry is to be acknowledged, but it is not possible to teach as many subjects as a young man of culture should know if Geometry and Algebra are also retained as compulsory subjects. To those who have a natural aptitude for Mathematics, and those who would take up a profession requiring previous knowledge of these branches of Mathematics, can select that subject in the secondary stage as one of their optional subjects.

Elementary drawing is to be included in the Primary stage as necessary for training the hand and the eye of the child and for developing in him a perception of beauty and a sense of proportion, but in the secondary stage it must be merely optional, and those who desire to take up a vocation in after-life in which a knowledge of drawing is necessary can take it as one of their optional subjects.

One main departure from present-day schemes of studies as great as the emphasis that has been laid on religious education, and the change in the medium of instruction, is compulsory Manual Training and the pursuit of a vocation. In the Primary stage this will in the main train a child's hand and eye besides providing for him a recreation with utility. But since the majority of the students in the Primary stage would become agriculturists, elementary theoretical and practical training should be imparted to them in agriculture, in addition to elementary instruction in Hygiene; and flower and vegetable gardening could easily lead to agriculture. In town schools this may be modified, and some other vocational study may be substituted for agriculture. And in the present state of India, spinning must be compulsory even for boys. But in the secondary and university stage also vocational study should be compulsory. Every school and college cannot and need not provide for the study of all vocations. But there is a vast choice from which each school and college can select such vocation as it can provide for locally. For instance, there should be no difficulty in Moradabad schools to provide for teaching "Bharat" or "Gilat" work, and in Aligarh schools to provide for lock-making, but carpentry, cookery masonry, dyeing, laundry, accountancy, stenography, smithy,

tailoring, weaving, tanning, book-binding, leather goods manufacturing and many others provide ample material from which to select. Throughout a student's career he should pursue one or more vocations, so that in few years Indian students may entirely get ird of the present financial helplessness and dependence upon employment as clerks or other low-paid employees in the public service. No educated lad should be able to justify, as so many do at present, his slavish dependence upon Government service, on the ground that he has no qualifications other than those required for a clerkship. It is not necessary that in after-life he should pursue the vocation that he has studied in school or college. But this vocational knowledge is there if it is ever required to provide for his maintenance; and there is no reason why, after having received such literary and cultural education as these schools and colleges will provide, a student should not organise a fairly large business of catering or tailoring, laundry or smithy. An educated man with practical knowledge of his vocation is expected, even with a very small capital, and in fact even with none at all save his own labour, to build up a fair business in course of time.

Besides this obvious utility, pursuit of vocational studies would impress the educated youth with the dignity and importance of labour, and also remove that estrangement that exists at present between the educated classes and the masses dependent upon vocation. And apart from improving the chances of a student in after-life, this vocational study will also be sure to result in the progress of the vocations themselves, for an educated and cultured man will not be content with mere imitation, but will soon proceed to improve and invent. It is not to be understood that this vocational study is to be any substitute for Technical Education. The step that is indicated here is merely one of supplementing literary education with vccational training, which is likely to take more than a few hours a week of the student's time. But a few hours a week which will be no additional tax on the already fagged brain, but would rather provide much needed relaxation, will help an educated young man in the course of 11 to 14 years to be a proficient workman well able to earn his bread

even with the sweat of his brow.

To some extent the Jamia is following the scheme of studies outlined here, and one of the chief reasons why such a scheme has not been fully followed is the lack of funds. We feel that this reason should no longer exist, and that the community should provide adequate funds to enable the Jamia to secure and even train in India and elsewhere, a set of teachers and professors who could teach the respective subjects to the students of the Jamia in Urdu which has to be the medium of instruction. It is no easy task to secure good teachers and professors who could teach even in English; but such has been the slavery of our minds that Indians who could teach any subject in the vernacular, instead of being the rule, are very rare exceptions. The ideal of the Jamia has already attracted some splendid teachers who have sacrificed the larger emoluments that they could easily secure elsewhere, and we have every hope that in course of time many other patriots of this type would be attracted to the Jamia. But it must be confessed that for some time to come the Jamia must depend in the main on those whose services could be secured only on the market rate. That rate is, as the whole world knows, exceedingly high to-day, thanks to the Indian Educational Service, to which as to other Indian services the lead is always given by the Indian Civil Service. Education is, at least in England still the most poorly paid service and it was not many years ago that splendid college tutors at Oxford received no more than £300 a year if even that. But when Government College professors in India must maintain motor cars and occasionally also a string of polo ponies and at any rate must keep their families in hill stations during the summer, if not in England, Indian educationists also demand the salaries of at least junior Deputy Collectors. If, therefore, the Jamia is to secure those rare beings, Indians who can teach their special subjects in Urdu, the Muslims of India must provide adequate funds for securing their services. But in another five or six years the old *alumni* of the Jamia would themselves be ready to become its teachers and professors, and a few are already preparing themselves for this work in Europe. From these we can expect and demand self-sacrifice as well as ability and the Jamia

expenditure would not then be so unduly high.

The Jamia must also engage the services of an Arab, a Persian, a Turk and an Afghan to teach Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Pushto by the Direct Method to the Jamia students. It is difficult in India, if not impossible, to secure Indian teachers of these languages who can rid themselves of the evil habit of beginning with musty grammar first, and the only remedy therefore is to get such *Ahli-Zuban* as do not know a word of any Indian language and would compel the students to learn their language in daily contact with them just as children learn their mother tongue. Luckily Arabs and Persians do not expect the emoluments even of Indian professors in Government service; but if the Jamia is to live from hand to mouth as it has been doing so far, it cannot escape the temptation of regarding Arab, Persian, Turk and Afghan teachers of their respective languages by the Direct Method as luxuries of which it should not dream to-day.

Above all, the atmosphere of the Jamia even to-day is a far more Islamic and national atmosphere than is to be found in any other Muslim educational institution, and that itself gives the Jamia sufficient title to substantial financial assistance from Indian Muslims. We do not desire to say one bitter word about Muslim students who are receiving education to-day. Nobody knows it better than we do that it is not always their fault that they are not at the Jamia. But whosoever's fault it may be, we feel and many of them feel themselves, that they are robbed of some of their most cherished ideals by the separation of Jamia students and teachers and the existence of the Jamia as a separate and distinct institution. The present writer met at a railway station some bright and smart looking men wearing Turkish fezes, and he was told that they were Aligarh boys studying in the University that has just celebrated its jubilee by receiving the Viceroy at Aligarh. He could not help going up to them and asking them why they wore Turkish fezes. The question was not easily intelligible to them, and may not be so to the reader, too, without further explanation. The fez was an indication of Islamic faith and of the world-wide sympathies of

Muslims and in particular of their sympathy with the Khilafat and with the Turks who had maintained it for four eventful centuries of hard struggle against Christian and European aggression. In the hour of the supermost and of Islam, of the Khilafat and of Turkey these students and their teachers and the trustees that managed that institution had at the very best remained neutral, and had refused to take sides as belligerents against the enemies of Islam, of Khilafat and of Turkey. These students were therefore asked what it was that they desired to indicate to the Turks by wearing their peculiar head dress. Did they mean to convey that if the existence of Islam or Khilafat or of Turkey was again in peril they would come to their rescue? They have certainly not done so in the crisis that began after the Armistice and that is not really yet over. How then could anyone form any expectations from them for the future? This was said more in sorrow than in anger and the students did not therefore misunderstand the question. But they admitted they were unable to answer it. This was a year and half ago, and since then the present writer has met at Aligarh and elsewhere many a Muslim student who has confessed that he has no ideal left to cherish. He has failed Islam and he has failed India. These are unsophisticated young men whose age and experience has not yet sufficiently hardened, and they have not yet learned to cover their own failure under the cynical formula that Non-co-operation has failed. Now at the Jamia there are still to-day some 100 young men who have not yet failed Islam and India, and still cherish the high ideals of their faith and of their nation.) There were, of course, many more such men at the Jamia not so long ago, and the temptation that other and better equipped institutions provided for them proved too strong for some of them and they left the Jamia. Some of those who are still there may be struggling against these very temptations and may yet fall. Manifestly we have no desire to run down, and we certainly do not despise the students that study elsewhere; nor do we place those who still study in the Jamia on a very high pedestal as being altogether of a different kind. There is only a question of degree in most cases, but it is not negligible. What we ask the Muslims is to say and so say it

finally whether they desire to preserve even this difference of degree, whether they want even those few that had remained steadfast to give up their cherished ideals, Islamic and national, and seek "careers" only. (If these ideals are worth something, then a place with the Islamic and national atmosphere of the Jamia must be maintained, and it should be properly equipped.) Cannot seventy millions of Muslims provide even ten lacs as a first instalment to maintain the Jamia even as *one among many others*? We shall be untrue to our ideals if we did not maintain that to our mind the ideal of the Jamia is the sole ideal that should prevail. *But we bow our head before the* "exigencies of practical politics," and only ask the Muslims of India whether they will not allow this sole ideal to survive even as one among many. (We cannot say that in future there is to be no "struggle for existence," and that we do not hope for the "survival of the fittest.") But to-day the appeal is modest enough, and the Jamia will be content to "live and let live." What, then, is the answer of the Muslim community? It must not be, as we have already said, "Oh! we like the Jamia to live by all means." What the Muslims have got to do to-day is to prove that they like it to live, and to provide the means for its survival.

MUSLIMS AND THE SARDA ACT

Statement presented to the Viceroy on behalf of the Muslim Deputation which waited on him of the 9th of November, 1929.

XIII

MUSLIMS AND THE SARDA ACT

"THE changes that have taken place in course of time," says Sir Gurdas Banarji, an eminent Hindu scholar and lawyer who was a Judge of the Calcutta High Court, "both in the internal structure and external surroundings of Hindu Society, must have continually presented motives for deviating from the rules laid down in the primeval code—motives which could but be insufficiently counteracted by the spiritual sanctions by which most of these rules were enforced. This led to innovation; and what was excused as necessary or desirable innovation in one generation came to be revered as custom in the next; and thus have been brought about slowly but steadily those numerous and important changes in the Hindu Law which may be seen at a glance by comparing the prevailing practices of the Hindu with those enjoined or reprobated in the institutes of Manu or any other ancient sage." "The rules of the Shastras," says Golap Chandra Sarkar, "in so far as they are related to secular as distinguished from purely spiritual matters, are not inflexible, but may be modified or replaced if repugnant to popular feelings, or if in the opinion of the learned the exigencies of Hindu Society require a change. The Shastras do not present any unsurmountable difficulty in the way of social progress, and the Hindus may reconstitute their society in any way they like." The Principal of the Oriental College of the Benares Hindu University says in his evidence before the Age of Consent Committee that it can be proved from the Dharma Shastras that there have been instances where owing to the change of time and social conditions and other causes the Dharma was changed, the Achara was changed; and if circumstances so arise, they can be changed again.

The Dharma Shastras of the Hindus had prescribed the age

of eight as the proper time for marriage of girls ; had also urged consummation immediately after puberty ; and had prohibited the remarriage even of virgin widows. Modern Hindu Society has in some measure revolted against such rules, and interpreting Hindu Law in the manner cited above, is seeking to modify or replace what is repugnant to popular feeling among the growing class of unorthodox Hindus. Taking advantage of Section 67 (2) (*b*) of the Government of India Act, 1919, which makes it lawful to introduce at any meeting of the Indian Legislature any measure affecting the religion or the religious rites and usages of any class of His Majesty's subjects, with the previous sanction of the Governor-General,—a short cut that has an irresistible attraction for so many "reformers" who, in the words of the Age of Consent Committee itself, take no interest in educating the public, Rai Sahib Harbilas Sarda, the author of "Hindu Superiority," obtained the previous sanction of the Governor-General, and on the 1st of February, 1927, introduced in the Assembly the Hindu Child Marriage Bill, the primary object of which was declared to be "to put a stop to child widowbood among the Hindus by invalidating marriages among Hindus below 12 years of age." In September, 1927, this Bill was committed to a Select Committee. The Home Member, in the course of his speech on that occasion, said that "legislation passed without consideration may have consequences very remote from those intended'. He must have been in a prophetic mood, indeed, for instead of invalidating marriages among Hindus below 12 years of age, and thereby putting a stop to child widowhood among Hindus, the legislation passed two years latter, we submit, without sufficient consideration, has had a consequence very remote indeed from that intended, namely, the penalising of certain Muslim marriages which were not only permitted by Islamic Law, but were contracted and performed by the Prophet himself and by his Companions, and were in some cases enjoined by Islamic Law. That Law has been grossly misunderstood, and conceptions of legislation prevailing to-day in Europe and America, which have no doubt influenced Hindu "reformers" seeking to modify or replace Shastric injunctions repugnant to popular feeling among the unorthodox, have

induced the majority of the members of the Indian Legislature, composed of officials, European non-officials, unorthodox Hindus and a very small number of Muslim members of the Assembly, either ignorant of Islamic Law or indifferent to its injunctions, to pass the Sarda Bill, which is opposed to Islamic Law on the subject of marriage, and is a clear interference in the religion of Muslims, and alters their personal law which alone was repeatedly guaranteed to be applied to them by British law-courts.

At the very outset it must be stated that the development of Muslim Jurisprudence does not present the same difficulties as have been encountered by those who examined the origins and history of European or Hindu Law. We do not need to push our researches back to the primitive family, nor to work our way through periods of centuries guided by the merest fragments of documents and hints of usages, or far-fetched inferences from hymns sung as part of religious ritual at various ceremonies. Muslim Jurisprudence was born in the light of history; it ran its course in a couple of hundred years; and has left at every important point authoritative evidence of its whence, its how and its whither.

To begin with, its comprehensiveness must be clearly grasped. According to Islam, Religion is the interpretation of Life, and no lacerating and devitalising distinctions, such as temporal and spiritual, are recognised by Islam. Like life, Islamic Religion is one complete and indivisible synthesis. Muslim Law, therefore, prescribes everything that a man shall do to God, to his neighbour and to himself. It takes all duty for its portion, and defines all action in terms of duty. Islam claims that its laws are intended to be applied to all mankind if it willingly embraces Islam; that they were framed by the Divine Legislator Himself, the Creator of the Universe; that He alone could best understand the human nature that He had created, and legislate for all mankind in conformity with it; and that His laws were as unalterable as human nature itself. In the Chapter of the *Quran* entitled "Rome," after describing how God had created the heavens and the earth, and men with different languages and complexions, He calls upon the Prophet to keep his face

invariably turned towards the natural and inherent religion of mankind, "the nature of Allah's creation, the nature in which He created man," and He lays down the Divine dictum that "there is no change in what Allah has created,' and declares that "this is the straight and unalterable religion, even though most men know it not."

It is on the bed-rock of this unalterable nature of man and human constitution unaffected by time or place that Islam and its Laws are based. The *Quran* itself has laid down for all times principles of human condut which are eternal veritics, and calls them "the boundaries of Allah" which must never be transgressed. Naturally, they are not many; but as amplification and illustration thereof Muslims have for their guidance the exnmple of the Prophet, who is declared by the *Quran* itself to be their exemplar. These two, the *Quran* or 'Word of God' revealed to the Prophet, and his *Sunnah* or example and precepts, the conrents, if not the words, of which were equally inspired, are the only two original sources of Islamic Law. But where neither form of *Nass* or text was available to Muslims for guidance, they were left free to exercise properly their own considered judgment, and while the Shiah sect depends in this matter on the authoritative dicta of Mujtahids, the Sunni sect relies on the Consensus of those qualified by their learning, and on Analogy or parallelism between a cause that has arisen and a rule in the *Quran* of the usage of the Prophet which is similar in some points but not precisely parallel.

In this manner, while the two basic principles of Islamic Law remain untouched through the centuries, in spite of changing fashions and the see-saw of popular leanings, new problems that present themselves from time to time and in different parts of the world are to be solved by the judgment of qualified Muslims, a judgment to that extent unfettered, but certainly not unaided by the two basic and original sources of Islamic Law already specified. Even such minor legislation is, however, to be the handiwork of qualified Muslims themselves, and Islamic Jurisprudence is therefore absolutely self-contained. In fact, even the execution of Islamic Law is exclusively confined to

Muslims themsevles placed in authority by Muslims, and Muslim Society is a pure Theocracy. This privilege the Muslim State freely extended to non-Muslim communities as well, and Christians, Jews and Hindus were permitted not only to follow their respective laws but also to administer them. This is the ideal spirit of tolerance for which a Muslim's heart eagerly craves, and if Muslims have submitted to non-Muslim public laws, or to the administration of their personal law by non-Muslim Judges and law-courts, it is only unwilling submission to *force majeur*. They cannot certainly acquiesce in legislation in matters covered by their personal law, whether by an alien Government or by Government composed of various communities inhabiting India. In fact, they cannot submit even to the legislation of a purely Muslim Government which goes beyond the canonical sources of Islamic Law, namely, the *Quran*, the *Hadees* and among the Sunnis, Consensus and Analogy, and among the Shiahs, *Ijtihad* or authoritative decisions of recognised religious leaders. The Muslims claim self-sufficiency for Islamic Law, and since nothing like *Suttee,* the burning of widows or human sacrifices to appease the wrath of the deity, injunctions with regard to child-marriage or prohibition of widow remarriage, finds any place in Islamic Law or Muslim usage, it cannot be said that demands preferred in the name of religion to leave such laws and usages untouched by legislation, if satisfied, would lead to practices inconsistent with individual safety and the public peace, and that they are condemned by every system of law and morality in the world, and therefore in such cases it is religion and not morality which must give away. Indeed, in the present instance it is in the name of morality itself that we demand it—it is the recently enacted law and not religion which must give way.

Islamic Law only is administered by the courts in British India in the cases of Muslims in matters relating to inheritance, wills, pre-emption, gifts, marriage, dower, divorce, parentage, guardianship, minority and endowments. The proviso in the Lucknow Pact which, like one of the articles in the Constitution of the Indian National Congress, gave the right of veto to two-thirds of

the Muslim and Hindu members of any Legislature with regard to any measure which they declared to be injurious to the interests of their community, did not apply to religion or the personal law of their community, for the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, Statutes of Parliament and Acts passed by the Indian Legislatures guaranteed non-interference in their religion and the application only of their own personal law to those communities. That veto related to other matters which affected merely the interests of the two communities, and the Leader of the House, speaking in the Council of State on the Sarda Bill on the 28th September last, had failed to understand this difference when he said that "the modification of the personal law of each community is within the jurisdiction of this Council," and that "if more than two-thirds of the members of the community do not oppose it, then the personal law of their community can be added to or modified by these Councils." That jurisdiction cannot be extended to a mixed Legislature composed of members of various communities where Islamic religion or the personal law of the Muslims is concerned when, in fact, it cannot be extended even to a purely Muslim Legislature. Non-interference in personal law must be guaranteed as part of the Fundamental Laws guaranteeing religious freedom, and one of the numerous reasons why the Muslim community does not accept the so-called Hindu-Muslim settlement contained in the Nehru Report is that the Muslims' personal law has not been guaranteed therein, though the British Government has repeatedly guaranteed it.

To return to a consideration of Islamic Law: a Muslim is told by his code of *Shariat* not only what is required under penalty, but also what is either recommended or disliked, though without reward or penalty being involved. It takes cognizance of many actions of which Western laws take no cognizance at all, and it specifies the relative praiseworthiness or blameworthiness of those actions. In consequence, actions are divided into five classes. First, necessary (*Farz* or *Wajib*)—a duty the omission of which is punished, the doing rewarded. Secondly, recommended (*Mandub* or *Mustahabb*)—the doing is rewarded, but the omission is not punished. Thirdly, permitted (*Ja'iz* or *Mubah*)

—legally indifferent. Fourthly, disliked (*Makruh*)—disapproved by the Law, but not under penalty. Fifthly, forbidden (*Haram*) —an action punishable by Law.

Unlike Hindu Dharma Shastras, which enjoin pre-puberty marriages and consummation immediately after puberty, and also unlike the Sarda Act, which penalises even post-puberty marriages in which the bridegroom is less than 18 years of age or the bride less than 14, Islamic Law leaves Muslim men and women free to contract marriage at any age. This is what an ideal law, such as Islam claims its *Shariat* to be, should be; for it has to be applied at all times, in all climes, and in all circumstances, and to fetter human freedom in such a case would be to make the law harsh and inflexible. Laws must regulate human nature, and not thwart it. Islamic Law takes the middle path between the Hindu Dharma Shastra and the Sarda Act which are the two extremes. Islam does not *enjoin* early marriages; but it does not *interdict* them either. According to the classification of human actions specified above, marriage is ordinarily *Mandub* and *Mustahabb* or recommended; and since there are numerous *Ahadees* (Traditions of the Prophet) in which the Prophet insists on the marriage of Muslims, marriage is regarded by Muslim Jurisconsults as *Sunnat-i-muakkidah*. In fact, the *Quran* itself refers to anchorites among the Christians and describes their renunciation of the world, including their celibacy, as an innovation not enjoined by God, but only self-imposed in order to please God, and yet a self-denial to which they could not steadfastly adhere.

Since the Creator has created mankind so that we should live and multiply, it was only natural that Islam should condemn celibacy without any necessity as well as murder and suicide. Our Creator has imposed upon us the double duty of self-preservation and preservation of the race. For this purpose he has given us two appetites, hunger and the sexual urge. Islam has, therefore, condemned celibacy as well as starvation, and the *Quran* mentions among God's gifts to us both food and our life-mates of the opposite sex. The *Quran* enjoins fasting and continence in the month of *Ramazan* as a discipline, so that we should learn to control both the appetites and never transgress beyond the bounds

of that which is *Ja'iz Mubah* or *Halal*, *i.e.* what is permitted. Illicit gratification of either appetite is forbidden or *Haram*. Islam does not enjoin, even within permitted limits, the gratification of our sexual appetite before maturity any more than it enjoins the gratification of hunger by eating fruits that God produces for us before they are ripe. But Islam repeatedly and very emphatically enjoins that we should not transgress the bounds fixed for us by Allah, whether in the matter of satisfying ordinary hunger by committing theft, or of relieving our sexual appetite by committing adultery; and although pre-puberty consummation is not allowed by Islamic Law, the relieving of sexual appetite by marriage is perfectly lawful after puberty, and even becomes *Farz* or *Wajib* (necessary), *i.e.*, a duty, the omission of which is punished, the doing rewarded, if the physical urge is so great that unless marriage takes place, transgression beyond illicit bounds is certain or very likely. Hindu Dharma Shastras enjoin pre-puberty marriages in *all* cases; and the Sarda Act prohibits post-puberty marriages as well in *all* cases until a boy has reached the age of 18 and the girl is 14; Islamic Law takes its stand in the middle; and enjoins marriage and its consummation after puberty only when the physical urge is so great that transgression beyond licit bounds is imminent. The Sarda Act claims to be based on the exigencies of physical hygiene; Islamic Law, on the other hand, is based on the exigencies of moral hygiene; and while extensively collected and scientifically scrutinized data are absent as evidence in support of the demand of the so-called "reformers," and their outcry is in the main due to the fashion of late marriages prevailing in the West, unfortunately there is only too much evidence everywhere justifying the demand of Islamic Law, in some cases at least, for marriage and for consummation after puberty. In short, while recognising the need for continence and self-control among the adolescent, and placing before Muslims the example of the Prophet himself and of his cousin and son-in-law Hazrat Ali, both of whom contracted their first marriage at the age of 25, Islam refuses to err on the wrong side, and would rather insure the moral purity of society than follow the fashion of the so-called "reformers," who certainly understand human nature, physical and moral, much less than their Creator.

While the "reformers" are ostensibly so anxious about the physical hygiene of the minors and adolescents, and a tempestuous agitation is going on in legislative circles, not a ripple disturbs the placid surface where moral hygiene is concerned, even through immorality is a far more insidious and powerful enemy of physical health itself than early marriage. Prostitution still prevails, and immorality is on the increase and is fast polluting prviate life as well. But luckily rural society is to a great extent still unpolluted. The penalisation of post-puberty marriage and consummation is bound to bring to our simple unsophisticated villagers the impurity and filth that tend to make the towns cesspools of immorality. In European countries too, where a minimum age is fixed for marriage, exceptions are sometimes made, "the most common reason for dispensation" mentioned in the League of Nations' report being that "the girl was about to become a mother" and that "marriage would enable the child to be born legitimate." Legal fictions such as this when a child born in wedlock, but not conceived in it, is called legitimate, do not appeal to us; but is it too much to expect that Government will give a universal dispensation to a community that seeks to enable its children to be conceived as well as born in wedlock?

We have a large number of texts from the *Ahadees* or Traditions of the Prophet enjoining marriage at an early age in order to keep Muslim society morally pure, and it is proposed to place them before your Excellency if you desire to have them carefully scrutinized. As hardly any *Alim* well versed in Islamic Law appeared before the Age of Consent Committee, and it was mainly composed of impatient partisans of "Reform", the recommendations of that Committee are based on a complete misunderstanding, if not deliberate misconstruction, of Islamic Law on the subject of marriage. Certainly pre-puberty consummation, or even consummation after puberty but before the wife is well able to sustain consummation, is not allowed by Islamic Law; and any steps taken to put a stop to such sexual intercourse without undue harassment and intrusion into the privacy of family life will be in consonance with Islamic Law,

traditions and culture. But the penalising of early marriage is in direct opposition to Islamic Law, whether it merely prohibits consummation after a post-puberty marriage, or even the solemnisation of pre-puberty marriage, as the Sarda Act does, and in both cases it is a clear interference in a Muslim's religion and in his religious rites and usages.

Such tables of figures as have been published by the Age of Consent Committee with regard to the mortality of girls married young, with regard to infant mortality and its relation to early marriages, and with regard to maternal mortality, abnormal confinements and still-births, certainly fail to establish anything like the exaggerated apprehensions on which the "reformers" base their case for penalising early marriages and post-puberty consummation. For instance, in 1911, the number of married girls under the age of 15 in Burma was less than two per thousand; and yet the number of deaths of girls between 15 and 20 years of age per thousand was as high as 12, while in Bihar and Orissa the figures were 233 married girls and only 14 deaths per thousand; and in the Central Provinces 195 married girls and only 13 deaths. In the Punjab the figures were as bad as 87 married girls and 24 deaths; but in Madras they were not half so bad, being 94 such girls and only 13 deaths. Similarly, in 1921, Burma had 103 married girls per thousand and 13 deaths, and Bihar and Orissa had 203 such girls and only 16 deaths. The Central Provinces had 207 such girls and 21 deaths, but the N-W-F Province had the same figure of deaths with only 30 married girls per thousand. Another table shows that while in 1921 in Burma, Bihar and Orissa and the Central Provinces, and in 1911, in Burma, the N-W-F. Province, Madras and the United Provinces the larger the number of girls married below 15 the more did the females die between the ages of 15 and 20 as compared with males, though not in proportion, the very reverse of this was true in the case of Bihar and Orissa, the Central Provinces, Bombay, the Punjab and Assam in 1911. A similar contrast is noticeable in the figures of death of the age period of 20 to 30. As regards infantile mortality, there is nothing to choose between the different provinces, though early marriage is very common in some, like

the Central Provinces, Bihar and Orissa, Bombay, the United Provinces and Bengal, and much less common in others, like Burma, the N-W-F. Province, the Punjab and Madras. Equally inconclusive is the statistical analysis of the figures of maternal mortality, still-births and abnormal confinements as given by Dr. R. Adiseshan, the Assistant Director of Public Health, Madras, prepared from over 7,000 confinements registered in Madras, Madura, Trichinopoly and Coimbatore during the period October, 1927, to September, 1928.

We, however, submit that if any Bill affecting the Age of Consent had been on the legislative anvil, the evils of early consummation would have been relevant. But there is no relevancy between the evils of early *consummation* and the penalisation of early *marriages*. In fact, a low minimum age for marriage cannot prevent the success of efforts made for stopping early consummation, as the example of Great Britain herself only too clearly proves. For the minimum age for marriage in Great Britain was the lowest, except for the Dominican Republic and Esthonia, out of 41 States compared in a Report of the "Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People" appointed by the League of Nations published in 1927-iv-8, being as low as 12, whereas marriages below the attainment of majority at the age of 21 are not very common in that country. It was not the taking of the short cut of legislation that brought about this result but the gradual change in public opinion; and if our "reformers" educate public opinion instead of showing here lip-loyalty to such reforms, they would succeed just as well in course of time without rousing 70 millions of Muslims into open revolt.

The Sarda Act only penalises early marriages; it does not prohibit early consummation, whether in wedlock or outside it. In other words, it says: "Thou shalt not marry, but thou mayst commit adultery"; and in effect in many cases it says: "Thou shalt not marry; thou shalt commit adultery instead." Islam, on the contrary, says: "Thou mayst marry at any age; but thou shalt not commit adultery." This antithesis is so clear and convincing that Muslims can well leave it to any thoughtful person,

whose mind is not totally warped by prejudice, to decide which of the two courses is the right one to follow.

We repeat that Islam does not encourage very early marriages and prohibits pre-puberty consummation, when it is injurious to the health of the wife, and it is not a question of too early consummation of marriage with which we are at all concerned when we desire the exclusion of Muslims from the operation of the Sarda Act. But we are entirely opposed to the penalisation of early marriages because it deprives the parents and guardians of minors of the right of giving away such minors in marriage when it is in the interest of the minors themselves that such marriages should be contracted. Such marriages are contracted not only in Muslim society and in the East, but were at one time quite common in non-Muslim society and in the West as well. It is only during the last century or two that early marriages have gradually become uncommon in the West, and instead of parents and guardians arranging marriage contracts, young men and young women themselves propose and accept offers of marriage. As a matter of fact, even now many marriages are arranged by parents and guardians on the Continent, while Royalty is nowhere quite as free to woo and win as commonalty, and the annulment of morganatic marriages is not altogether unheard of even to-day. Islam from the very outset made marriage, with all its sanctity bordering on sacrament, a civil contract between the bridegroom and the bride requiring nothing but their own agreement, and did not insist even on the presence of a Registrar of Marriages, let alone a priest. The substantive law of Islam requires only the offer and acceptance by the two parties to the contract, and it is only the adjective law which requires the presence of two witnesses in order to protect women being over-reached by cheats and scoundrels pretending to contract a permanent union when in reality only desiring to satisfy their lust. Islam is sternly opposed to what is called Free Love; but it insists on marriage being free, and even when permitting guardians to give away their minor wards in marriage, it gives to the male minor full freedom to divorce the bride chosen for him by his parent or guardian if he is convinced that she can-

not be a proper life-mate for him, and to the female minor to repudiate the marriage on attaining puberty unless the guardian is her own father or paternal grandfather, who can be trusted to do nothing against her best interests; and even such marriages are voidable according to Shiah Law and many schools of Sunni Law.

But in exceptional cases early marriages are dictated by expediency in the interests of the minors themselves, and the Age of Consent Committee itself records that early marriages are fostered among Muslims in the United Provinces, among other things, by "some exigency, or convenience or the idea of securing some advantage which will be otherwise lost." A very common instance in the case of a parent or guardian lying on his deathbed, or going on a pilgrimage to the Hejaz or other Holy places, and fearing that his child or ward might fall into evil hands after his death, and her property or person itself might sustain injury unless she is married in his lifetime, or before he sets out on his long journey; and who could be a better guardian in his place than her husband or father-in-law, whose own interest would be to look after the person and property of the minor with prudence and care? It must be remembered that in the East, and specially among Muslims whose womenfolk live in Purdah, marriages have in most cases to be arranged by parents and guardians, though consent is the very essence of the contract of marriage, and whatever competition there is in the "marriage market" is between parents and guardians, and not between the young people themselves. In the circumstances there are times when the rank and position of the parent or guardian greatly assist in securing a more eligible *parte* than could otherwise be secured, and even when there is no fear of imminent death, early marriage may be dictated by the fear of vicissitudes of fortune. And in many cases it is economy that dictates the marriage of two girls at one and the same time, one younger than the other by a year or two, who would otherwise have been married a few years later, but is married earlier only to save the double expenditure and work that two separate marriages would have involved.

In view of all possible contingencies and exigencies, an ideal

system of law could not forbid early marriages, and Islam has therefore fully permitted it, and the Prophet confirmed this with his own sacred example by marrying Hazrat Ayesha when she was in her seventh year only, though she was sent to live with the Prophet only after she had attained her puberty. According to one tradition, even Hazrat Fatima, his own daughter, was only 9 years old when she was given away in marriage to the Prophet's cousin Hazrat Ali. It is related that when a Muslim living outside Madinah came to the Prophet and asked when each of the five daily prayers were to be offered, the Prophet asked him to stay with him for two days and one day the Prophet offered each of the five prayers the moment the time commenced, and on the next day towards the very end of the proper time, and then asked his visitor to offer his prayers at any time between these two limits. After the Prophet's first wife, Hazrat Khadeeja who was 40 when he married her, while he was himself 25, had passed away after 25 years of their happy married life during which he married no other lady, he contracted at about the same time two marriages, and while one of the wives he then wedded was the child wife Hazrat Ayesha, who herself states that she used to play with her dolls in her nursery even at the time when she was sent to live with the Prophet, the other was a very elderly lady with whom it became impossible to exercise conjugal rights only a few years after the marriage. May this not signify that the Prophet in this way exemplified that both early and late marriages were permitted by Islam just as he exemplified the permission to offer the five daily prayers both early and late?

Unfortunately no one well-versed in Islamic Law was a member of the Age of Consent Committee appointed by Government, nor did the *questionnaire* of the Committee include the question of questions whether Islamic Law permitted the penalisation of marriages below a certain age. Only 36 Muslims who had sent written answers to the questions of the Committee, were orally examined by the Committee, and of the very few among these who were qualified to speak as Ulama, not one supported such legislation as was contemplated. Nevertheless the knowledge of Islamic Law that Muslim members of the Com-

mittee possessed compelled as many as two out of three to write Minutes of Dissent with regard to the penalisation of early marriages. But need we be surprised to find that the non-Muslim members of the Committee, impatient to take the short cut of legislation, have grossly misrepresented Islam? Indeed, the Committee's statement on the subject betrays woeful confusion of thought, if not wilful distortion of Islamic Law.

The Committee says in its report:

"It is conceded by the theologians examined before this Committee that there is no express provision in the *Quran* enjoining the celebration of marriage or bringing about consummation at any particular age. In short, the *Quran* is silent on these points, and the legislative enactment on the subject would not be at variance with the injunctions of the *Quran*. . . . It is clear that all *Hadeeses* that have come to our knowledge favour post-puberty consummation. . . . Certain *Hadeeses* are quoted to show that the Prophet preferred marriages soon after puberty; but there are some other *Hadeeses* from which it may safely be concluded that marriages after the age of discretion were preferred by the Prophet. It cannot therefore be argued that legislation on this point is strictly at variance with the sayings of the Prophet. The third source of Islamic Law is *IJMA'*, *i.e.*, the consensus of opinions of learned men. The Muslim theologians of India are not agreed on the point as to marriage and consent legislation being an interference with Muslim religion, and thus there is no *Ijma*. We endorse the remarks made by the witness Syed Nawab Ali, Principal, Bahauddin College, Junagadh, in his evidence: 'Unfortunately under the present circumstances *Ijma* is very difficult here in India. How many are there in India who can be considered as qualified to give opinions? How many are there in India who have spent their life in the study of religion and religious law? The fourth source, *viz.*, the *Qiyas*, would certainly favour such legislation when once it is provided that it is in the interests of the community at large. It may also be noted that according to Muslim Law, marriage is not merely a civil contract, but is an act enjoined by religion, the object of which is the procreation of 'Aulad-i-Saleh' meaning by that expression progeny fit to serve God and His creatures and if it be conceded, as it ought to be, that the offspring of early marriages are weaklings and unfit to serve God or humanity, it follows that such marriages are against the spirit of Islam.'

This is a gross travesty of Islamic Law and shows colossal ignorance of all the four sources of Islamic Law that have been enumerated. It is true that *Quran* does not *enjoin* the celebra-

tion of marriage or consummation at any particular age; but it clearly *permits* early marriage, and is certainly not silent on that very important point, for it calls upon guardians of minor orphans to marry other women if they fear that they would be doing injustice to their wards on account of their wealth or beauty in solemnising marriages with them not in their interest but in their own; but where there is no such fear, they are left at perfect liberty to marry their minor orphan wards. Precisely in the same manner, and in the very same verse, polygamy is permitted if there is no apprehension of failing to do justice between more wives than one. Would the Indian Legislature not penalise polygamy also on the self-same ground, namely, that such legislation is not opposed to any *injunction* of the *Quran* asking Muslims to marry more wives than one? Could not the same be said of divorce, which the Prophet himself emphatically declared to be of all things *permitted* the most unpleasing to Allah? To forbid these would be to sit on the very safety-valve of set purpose provided by the Maker of that very intricate machinery called Man.

In another place, when prescribing the period during which a divorced wife is forbidden remarriage, and the husband is wisely given the opportunity to reconsider and revoke a possibly hasty decision dictated by anger or misunderstanding, the *Quran* lays it down that for such divorced wives as have passed the age up to which menstruation takes place, the period is three months instead of three successive menses; and the same period is prescribed for girls who have not yet commenced to menstruate and for older women who have only temporarily ceased to menstruate, while for those who have conceived, the period of gestation provides the limit. These are very clear Quranic texts permitting pre puberty marriages, and Muslims can never submit to the penalisation of such marriages, which would only mean the repeal of Quranic Law by human and a non-Islamic Legislature, and the declaration that the Prophet of Islam and his Companions who contracted such marriages were guilty of crime.

As regards *Ahadees*, they of course favour post-puberty

consummation: for Islamic Law condemns pre-puberty consummation; but where danger of transgression is imminent, consummation immediately after puberty is, as we have shown, not only recommended but *enjoined* and in such cases the prohibition of consummation is clearly compelling Muslims to disobey the *injunction* of Islam. And although naturally marriages after the age of discretion were preferred by the Prophet, and his own example furnishes numerous precedents, marriages before the age of discretion were contracted and solemnised by the Prophet himself and by his Companions. It therefore clearly follows that legislation on this point, such as the Sarda Act, is at variance not only with the "sayings" but also with the doings of the Prophet.

As for *Ijma*, there is and has always been universal consensus of opinion among Jurisconsults and Ulama of Islam running through thirteen centuries, and even if the remarks made by the witness cited above had any justification, which unfortunately they have not – for there are still living to-day hundreds of Ulama who have spent their lives "in the study of religion and religious laws" and are certainly qualified to give opinions—their endorsement by non-Muslims so ignorant of Islam could be of no value. What the Ulama think of the Sarda Act is no longer open to question, and we assert without fear of contradiction that the statement of the Committee that "the Muslim theologians of India are not agreed on the points as to marriage and consent legislation being an interference with Muslim religion" is the polar opposite to truth, and we submit that this gross misrepresentation must have misled many a member of the Indian Legislature and the Government themselves and induced them to vote against the Muslim members' amendment, the enactment of which we desire, since the consideration of the Sarda Bill had been expressly postponed by Government so that the Indian Legislature might be guided by its inquiry and report. This is a very clear case of misdirection of the Legislature parallel to the misdirection of a Jury by the wrong summing-up of a Judge, which is universally held to vitiate the entire proceedings and their result.

Lastly, it seems to us that these ladies and gentlemen have not the faintest notion with regard to the real significance of *Qiyas* and they would rather encourage the procreation of illegitimate progeny than permit the procreation of "Aulad-i-Saleh." So many of our leading men who have served God and His creatures nobly in the past have been the offspring of early marriages, and the same is true of so considerable a number to this day, that to call them weaklings, unfit to serve God or humanity, is a wild and wicked conjecture mistaken for the *Qiyas* of Muslim Jurisprudence.

There is no doubt that early marriages are more common in India than they need be; but the figures supplied by the Census reports do not clearly indicate how many Muslim girls are married before they attain puberty. The statement showing the age of puberty among 3,000 girls living in Calcutta prepared by Government during the discussion of the Age of Consent Bill of 1924 shows that among Indians more than 12 per cent of the girls attain puberty within 12 years of age, while more than 36 per cent attain puberty between the ages of 12 and 13, more than 29 per cent between the ages of 13 and 14, and nearly 14 per cent between the ages of 14 and 15, so that 92 per cent attain puberty by the time they reach the age of 15. But as many as 33 per cent of European girls born in Europe but living in Culcutta, and 34 per cent of European girls born in India attain puberty only between the ages of 15 and 19 as compared to only 7 per cent of Indian girls. Among natives of Europe the general age at which puberty is attained is, according to this statement itself, two years later than among natives of India. Marriage statistics furnished by the Census reports for the ages between 10 and 15 cannot therefore supply precise information as to pre-puberty marriages, let alone as to pre-puberty consummation. But if pre-puberty marriages are anywhere very common among Muslims they are so only in those Provinces where the Muslims are either a small minority, or are mainly descendants of converts from Hinduism, and where Hindu culture and tradition predominate. Where Muslim culture and traditions are predominant, even the Hindus

have greatly been influenced by them and early marriages are rare. In describing the general conditions in the Punjab, where, next to Bengal, the Muslim population is the largest, and as the Age of Consent Committee admits, where "there is a larger percentage of Muslims of foreign blood, *i.e.*, non-converts, than in any other province, the proportion being estimated at 15 per cent of the population," it states that "the tendency has been for Muslims to approximate themselves to the Hindu custom in this regard rather than for the Hindus to modify their practices under the influence of Muslim example." That being the case, the first step should have been to reform the Hindu community, as Mr. Sarda's original Bill sought to do. The Committee admits that the public in general is indifferent; that public opinion is not developed ; and in the case of one province where the reformer is so prominent, namely, the Punjab, the Committee cites the remarks of the Census Officer that "the influence of the reformer is confined to the educated section and has not reached the masses." If the classes approached the masses more than they do at peesent, and the reformer did not preach only to the converted, legislation would be no more necessary here than it was in Great Britain. But even if it was, it should be confined to the Hindus who claim that their Dharma has been changed only too often and can be changed again, and who have not the same religious scruples against legislation with regard to their personal law. That is what the large majority of Muslims in the Assembly, and all without a single exception in the Council of State, sought to do when they moved an amendment for the exclusion of the Muslims from the operation of the Sarda Bill. But the overwhelming non-Muslim element in the Indian Legislative, including the official and the European non-official elements, swept aside the Muslim opposition.

It must be remembered that 22 Muslim members of the Assembly presented a written statement to the Home Member soon after the Select Committee had entirely altered the nature and scope of the Sarda Bill and the Bill so altered came up for consideration in September, 1928. In that statement the Muslim

members declared that they were opposed to the Bill in its altered form, as it was at variance with their *Shariat* and affected their personal law; and at the same time one of them handed over the Home Member a *Fatwa* or *Responsa Prudentium* signed by 74 Ulama. When the Bill came up again for consideration before the Assembly in February, 1929, a point of order was raised that the Bill could not be proceeded with as it had not received the previous sanction of the Governor-General as required by Section 67 (2) (*b*) of the Government of India Act, such santion having been taken for an entirely different measure invalidating child marriages among Hindus in order to put a stop to child widowhood among them. The Home Member could only say that "the House interpreted the general intention of the original Bill to be to regulate child marriages, and I *think* with that intention the Bill was submitted for the sanction of the Governor-General. I *infer* and I *think* it is with that intention that the Governor-General granted sanction. *My own view* therefore would be that no further sanction should be necessary." Even after such a reply, which neither indicated the personal conviction of the speaker, nor could carry conviction to others, the President disallowed the point of order. This was clearly an error which deprived the Muslims of the opportunity of being consulted by Your Excellency before a measure so seriously affecting their religion and religious rites and usages could be accorded the sanction for introduction required by law precisely for such a purpose. This, we admit, vitiates the subsequent proceedings altogether, and they can be rectified only by the exclusion of the Muslims from the operation of the Act.

When the Bill finally came up for consideration last September, it was rushed through in spite of 16 Muslim members of the Assembly once more reading out a written statement against the passage of the Bill. No less than 12 elected Muslim members voted for the exclusion of the Muslims from its operation, and only 5 voted against that amendment, while only 7 out of 29 Muslim elected members expressed agreement with the unamended Bill. In the Council of State the Muslim opposition was still greater, and all Muslims without an exception voted against it.

Even after this the Muslim members of the Indian Legislature took a deputation to His Excellency Lord Goschen to request him to withhold his assent, and His Excellency based his postponement of a final decision on the complicated character of the question which necessitated the most careful consideration. And yet only a couple of days after His Excellency accorded his assent to this highly objectionable Bill, the enactment of which can never be tolerated by any believing Muslim. This is the long-drawn history of the Sarda Act, and since we cannot ring down the curtain on a result so intolerable to the entire community barring a few individuals, we have with great difficulty persuaded so many leading public men and Ulama to agree to the launching of yet another effort, and we rely upon Your Excellency to take steps to enact an amending Bill excluding the Muslims from the operation of the Sarda Act and to protect the personal law of Muslims from such interference. We trust no question of prestige will let the Government hesitate to rectify an error of judgment entailing such grave and intolerable consequences for the Muslim community in India.

With the Sarda Act placed on the Statute Book as a precedent before the Indian Legislature, there is no knowing what other Islamic laws will not be assailed next; and since it is not only the British element in the Indian Legislature that seems to be determined to throw Islmic as well as Hindu Law into the melting pot of man-made legislation, but also the Indian element that claims to be Nationalist and would replace the British element, the question has assumed all the more gravity. In fact, one Muslim member sought to-differentiate Sociology from Religion, and when the majority of the Indian Legislature takes such a narrow view of Religion, and even a few members returned by separate Muslim electorates—no doubt born in Muslim families, but certainly not believing in Islam as a perfect and complete faith needing no reform, and the one religion approved by and accepted of God, the One and the Only Legislator of Islamic Law—can be found seeking to improve upon Islam by their own crazy handiwork, it requires no special perspicuity or power of prophecy to foretell what fate is in

reserve for the personal law of Muslims at the hands of a legislature foreshadowed in the constitution framed by these so called Nationalists. There is so much talk of freedom in these circles; but these sons and daughters of freedom, who pick up with avidity every Western fashion, generally when it is about to be discarded in the West itself, would rob the Muslims of the perfect freedom that Islam gives to its followers; but Muslims would tolerate any restrictions placed on their freedom in the matter of age of marriage and of post-puberty consummation when it is not injurious to the health of the wife as little as they would tolerate any restr ctions sought to be placed on their freedom in the matter of polygamy or divorce. It is true that, in these degenerate times, when Islam has fallen on evil days and evil tongues, the spirit of the Law of Islam is honoured more in the breach than in the observance; but the letter of the Law cannot on that account be thrown on the scrap-heap. It must be remembered that Islam does not contemplate only the law courts but also the Final Court of "the Lord of the Day of Judgment," and, while leaving overt to law courts to punish, it has reserved the spirit that moves man to action to be judged by Him alone "Who knoweth what is hidden as well as what is manifest." Those who escape punishment for their misdeeds in this world are not going to escape it in the next, whether it be for contracting early marriages that are more injurious than beneficial, or for marrying more wives than one while fearing inability to do justice between them, for divorcing a wife without compelling necessity. No man could have known better than the Maker of man how he would ignore the spirit of the Law even when obeying it in the letter. But having created man in His own image, He has left him to do what he chooses. Divine Law does not by itself pretend to make men moral, and we can still less make them moral by an Act of Parliament. That law alone can be ideal which would rather spare a thousand guilty persons than punish a single innocent person, and since no guilty person can escape punishment on the Day of Judgment, why need we be so anxious to punish them here also by such legislation as would penalise the most innocent action of thousands? We submit once more that Muslim will never

submit to such intolerant interference with their sacred law. They will not hesitate to disobey any law robbing them of their religious freedom, and they would not be detereed by the sanctions of the Sarda Act. It is only too evident that Your Excellency has been sufficiently moved by what you have seen on the spot to seek to inaugurate an era of conciliation and concord. Would it not be an irony of fate if just on the threshold of this era the Muslims are left to battle with their feelings of resentment on the enactment of a law to which no one can ever reconcile himself so long as he believes in the truth of Islam ?

FREEDOM OR DEATH !

Speech delivered at the Fourth Plenary Session of the Round Table Conference held at St. James's Palace, London, on Wednesday, the 19th November, 1930.

"I want to go back to my country," said Mohamed Ali in the course of this historic speech, "if I can go back with the substance of freedom in my hand. Otherwise I will not go back to a slave country . . . If you do not give us freedom in India," he declared, "you will have to give me a grave here."

And these were no empty words. Mohamed Ali died in London a month and a half after he made this speech and was buried in Jerusalem.

XIV

FREEDOM OR DEATH!

MR. Chairman, may I exercise the privilege of the invalid and remain seated? My friend, Dr. Moonje, has explained his position as to how he has been called a traitor to his country. I think we are bracketed together here again. As he knows very well, on the day when he and I were to depart from India black flags were to be flown to wish us Godspeed, and the wishes of people with whom we had been working all these years were that the boat "Viceroy of India" might prove very unseaworthy. Even when I came to this country one newspaper in England which I have helped to stabilise financially—I am very glad to see it has a million sale today—the "Daily Herald," published my photograph and called me a convert—I suppose a convert from patriotism to treachery. There is in Parliament, besides the Conservative peer who spoke yesterday frankly and sincerely, another very Conservative gentleman, who was my tutor, my professor at Oxford, Sir Charles Oman, and it is from his history that I quote one short sentence which formed the subject of one of the questions asked us in the Indian Civil Service Examination, for which I appeared and failed: "The Saracen alone it was impossible to convert." I do not claim to have in me Aryan blood like all the white people here and Dr. Moonje. I have the blood in me which my Lord Reading—who sent me to prison —has perhaps running in his veins. I am a Semite, and if he has not been converted from Zionism, I too am not converted from Islam, and my anchor holds. I am the only person belonging to my party who has been selected by His Excellency the Viceroy, or the Government of His Majesty here, or whoever it is who has appointed these wonderful Delegates. Whose Delegates we are we do not know. I do not pretend to represent anybody: but I will say this much, and I feel certain that when

you have heard me—I hope patiently—you will say that I am right in my claim, that at least I am not misrepresenting myself, and I think that should be enough. In politics there is too much misrepresentation even of oneself.

In reply to Lord Peel, I will only quote to him from an English poet as I did when we were going through the lobby. I said, "I hope your Lordship is a Conservative and will remain a Conservative; because the only definition that I read of a Conservative was in Tennyson, who said,

'He is the best Conservative
Who lops the mouldered branch away.'"

I think those ideas which Lord Peel expressed, very sincerely and frankly, really represent the mouldered branch which should be lopped away. This is my only answer to him. As regards the other Conservative, our own Prince from India, namely, His Highness the Maharaja Sahib of Rewa, I am not quite sure about his conservatism. If he takes Burke to be a Conservative, and quotes him at the end of his speech, I would say: "Be a Conservative and stick to it," for, quoting Burke, His Highness said, "Small minds and large empires go ill together." If the British Empire—call it Empire, call it Commonwealth of Nations, whatever you choose to call it I do not care—if the British Empire desires to remain big, the small minds that have been visible and audible only too long must disappear. If you had followed Burke, you would not have lost America, and you would not be talking of parity to-day in building warships. There should be much more talk of charity. And you would not have all those bebts to pay. You would not have all that worry. You would not have to go so often to Geneva to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference. How long that preparation is going to take Heaven only knows. All these things came in because you forgot your greatest politician, your greatest statesman, who was the man who, in the House of Commons, was called the "dinner bell," because when Burke got up to speak, you all left and went to the dining room. You still do that to people who are like Burke, and I therefore say—and I quote him once again—"Men, not measures." I do not care

what constitution you prepare for us; but all would be well if you have got one man in England who is a real man—

"Oh God! for a man with heart, head, hand,
Like some of the simple great ones gone
For ever and ever by.
One still strong man in a blatant land,
Whatever they call him, what care I?—
Aristocrat, autocrat, democrat—one
Who can rule and dare not lie."

I hope my old friend Mr. MacDonald will at least prove the man to rule, and that he would not dare to lie to his own Party, to his own conscience, to his dead wife, and to his living country; and if you people of all parties assist him, as you should, I assure you we will make history. But even more than I trust my old friend Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, I, a republican, make this confession, that I place my trust in the man—I call him a man, because "a man's a man for a' that"—who inaugurated this Conference in the Gallery of the House of Lords, whose name is George. Whether you call him His Majesty or whatever you call him, he is a man! He knows India better than any of his Ministers, past or present, and I am looking up to him to do justice to the 320 millions who constitute one-fifth of the whole of humanity, and I am strengthened in that belief by the wonderful patriotism shown by the Princes arrayed over there, the conservative element in India. It must be a revelation to my Lord Peel and to my Lord Reading; it is no revelation to me. I am again a unique person. While I am a British subject—though I was yet being excluded from the Indian Civil Service Examination because they said I was not a "natural born British subject"—provisionally they admitted me, till evidence from my mother came in, and they finally admitted me—I happen also to be the subject of an Indian State, and probably in that respcct too I am a unique person in this Conference. I was born in a State; I have served in that State I have served in another State, Baroda—my master, the Gaekwar is here; I ate his salt for seven years—and when I was dying two years ago it was an Indian Prince, His Highness of Alwar, who sent me at his own cost

his own doctor here. When I was supposed to be going to die once more at Simla, it was a Prince, whom I was once about to begin to teach as a private tutor, the Nawab Sahib ofBhopal, who exercised the truest hospitality—which the British are not yet exercising—he turned his guest-house into a hospital for me. The British will be extending their hospitality to me in the letter as well as they are doing in the spirit, if they make me a free patient in every hospital that there is. When I was sent to Simla to the hospital I made a judicious separation between two finances, a lady on one side and military officer on the other, who were to be married very shortly. I occupied a room between them! Both were ailing. The lady asked our doctor, when she saw a strange looking Indian coming into the European quarters, "What is this old man ailing from." The doctor said, "Ask me rather what the old man is not ailing from." A man with my dilated heart; with my approaching and recurrent blindness through retinitis; with my o: ce gangrened foot, with neuritis—this huge bulking foot through œdema; with albuminaria; with diabetes, and the whole long list that I could give you if Colonel Gidney would not think I was becoming his rival as a medical man, I say no sane man with all these ailments would have travelled seven miles. And yet I have come seven thousand miles of land and sea because, where Islam and Iadia are concerned, I am mad, and, as the "Daily Herald" puts it, I am a "convert"; from a "rebel" against the Government, I have become a "traitor" to my country, and I am now working "with the Government." I say I can work even with the Devil if it is to be, like this work, in the cause of God.

I hope you will forgive this long introduction about my ill-health and ailments and all sorts of things; but the fact is that to-day the one purpose for which I came is this—*that I want to go back to my country if I can go back with the substance of freedom in my hand. Otherwise I will not go back to a slave country. I would even prefer to die in a foreign country so long as it is a free country, and if you do not give us freedom in India you will have to give me a gvave here.*

I begin with the Conservatives by thanking them. When I

met Mr. Baldwin at the dinner which the Government hospitality provided for us, when I was really very ill and ought to have been in bed, I was watching for the cherrywood pipe, and, thank God, it came out. So I went up to Mr. Baldwin, and I said, "In two ways you have made history. Although a Conservative belonging to a party of the so-called idle rich, you have at least been human enough to establish this rule, that where only Coronas could be smoked after dinner an honest man could now bring out his shag, put it into a cherrywood pipe, as I used to do at Oxford, and smoke it." But, as I told him, he has done another hostoric thing also. He has sent out a Conservative Viceroy of the type of Lord Irwin ! If any man has saved the British Empire to-day, it is that tall, thin Christian ! If Lord Irwin was not there to-day, heaven only knows what would have happened. At least I would not be the "convert" I am supposed to be. We should not have been at this Round Table. It is for the sake of peace, friendship and freedom that we have come here, and I hope we shall go back with all that. If we do not, we go back into the ranks of fighters where we were ten years before. They may now call us traitors to the country. You may then call us rebels or outlaws. We do not care.

I have said something about His Excellency Lord Irwin, but I do not wish to associate all that with his Government. They have woefully mismanaged things. The only good point about their Despatch is that it has provided us with another "historic document." The Simon Commission's Report is not the only document we have to consider. TheDespatch is a most disappointing document. The best thing we can do after it is to create our own "historic document" here. The best hearts and the best brains of two big countries are assembled here. Many who ought to have been here are still in gaol in Innia. Mr. Jayakar, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, and I tried our hands at peace-making between the Viceroy and Gandhiji, but we failed. I was the first in the field, but failed. I hope we shall not fail when we go back to our country this time, carrying with us the substance of freedom.

Lord Peel said, "Oh, yes, but when you go back to your country with a constitution such as you want those people who

are not co-operating will wrest it from your hands." Wrest it! When I can fight the British I can fight the Indians too. But give me something to fight for. Do not let me have to take back from here a charter of slavery and then expect me to fight my own people. I could not do it, and if I tried to do it, I should fail. But with freedom in our hands I would gladly go back to those in whose name my friend, Mr. Jayakar, spoke. He claimed to speak for Young India. I think he knows that, although I am older than him in years, I am a younger man in heart, in spirit, in temperament and in love of fighting. I was non-co-operating when Mr. Jayakar was still practising in the law courts. (Mr. Jayakar shook his head.) Anyhow he was not in gaol with me. My brother and I were the very first to be sent to gaol by Lord Reading. I bear him no grudge for that; but I want the power also, when Lord Reading goes wrong again in India, to send him to gaol.

I have not come to *ask* for Dominian Status. I do not believe in the *attainment* of Dominion Status. The one thing to which I am committed is complete independence. In Madras in 1927 we passed a resolution making that our goal. In 1928, in the Convention of All Parties, the adoption of the Nehru Report Constitution was moved, the very first clause of which was about Dominion Status. Even my old secretary, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the President of the Congress to-day, was kept down by his father. There is a Persian proverb which says: "Be a dog, do not be a younger brother." And when you see my big brother over there, "seven feet by five," as Colonel Wedgwood called him, you can well believe, I believe, in this Persian proverb. In the case of Jawaharlal I would say, "Be a cat, do not be the son of your father." For it was his father who, as President of the Congress, throttled poor Jawaharlal at Calcutta in 1928. Well I got up in his place, when he could not speak for complete independence, and I opposed the clause dealing with Dominion Status. But in 1929 I would not go further like Jawaharlal and make it mycreed, because once we make it our creed in the Congress, we cannot admit anybody into the Congress who does not hold that creed. I liked to keep the door open for negotiation.

I would not like to slam the door in the face of anybody. His Excellency Lord Irwin, a Conservative Viceroy, was "the man on the spot." And he was sufficiently impressed by what he saw on the spot and came here. When we come to London we hear that everybody is appealing to "the man in the street." Whether "the man in the street" is ever heard or not, I do not know; but Lord Rothermere and Lord Beaverbrook and everybody else always talk about "the man in the street" as the final court of appeal. In India it is always "the man on the spot." Well, "the man on the spot" came here and he talked to the leading "man in the street," who is presiding here. I am sure he preached to the converted. They brought round Mr. Baldwin also; they brought round some Conservatives; they brought round everybody they could and made the announcement that Dominion Status was meant, when in 1917 they said "Responsible Government." That cleared the fog which had been created in a very memorable meeting of the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1924 by the Officer in charge of the Home Department at the time, who I am glad is present here to-day.

As I said two or three days ago, India has put on fifty-league boots. We are making forced marches which will astonish the world and will not go back to India unless a new Dominion is born. If we go back to India without the birth of a new Dominion we shall go back, believe me, to a lost Dominion. We shall go back to an America. Then you will witness, not within the British Commonwealth or the British Empire, but outside it, with the Indian Princes, with Dr. Moonje, with Mr. Jayakar, with myself and my brother, a Free and United States of India. It will be something more than that. As I wrote shortly after leaving Oxford long years ago, in India we shall have something better than an America, because we shall not only have a United States, but we shall have United Faiths.

> "Not like to like, but like in difference;
> Self-reverent each and reverencing each;
> Distinct in individualities,
> But like each other, e'en as those who love."

It is with these passions surging in our hearts that we have

come here. It now depends upon our Conservative friends, upon our Radical friends, upon our Labour friends, and still more upon the one man whom I trust more in England than anybody else—His Majesty King George, the grandson of Victoria the Good, whose love for India nobody dare deny. Her whole life was the Magna Charta of India, and in her grandson's time history will be written again like this : "George III lost America, George V won India ! "

We are told that there are difficulties. It is said, "Look at the States." But I come from the States, and I know they present no difficulty whatever. "Then there is the Army." Well what about the Army? It is the biggest indictment against Great Britain that the Army is not ours to-day, and if you ever use that excuse of the Army you will condemn yourselves out of your own mouths. Let me tell you frankly and honestly, but in a friendly way, that your greatest sin was the emasculation of India.

I am glad to hear my friend, Dr. Moonje, say "Hear, hear." I was very sorry to hear him talk about our people being fired upon and therefore running away for a time and then coming back. We have 320,000,000 of people. When they can afford to die in millions from famine and from plagues, surely they can afford to die from British bullets too. That is the lesson which Gandhiji wanted to teach us, and that is the lesson which we must learn now. In 1913 I was in this country when Gandhi was leading his movement in South Africa. Mr. G. K. Chesterton presided over a meeting in the Essex Hall, and he called upon me to speak. Other speakers had spoken of Gandhi's new philosophy. I said, "Please understand one thing about that. Whether it is his philosophy or Tolstoy's, Jesus Christ's or mine, it is the universal human philosophy." Nobody wins in a battle if there is merely the will to kill. You must have the will to die even before the will to kill. In India we have not the power to kill, but the moment we develop the will to die, numbers will tell. 320,000,000 of people cannot be killed. There is no mechanization for which you can find money to kill 320,000,000 people. Even if you have got that mechanization, even if you have got the *materiel*, you

have not the *morale* (or *immorale*) to dare to kill 320,000,000 people. We must have in us the will to die for the birth of India as a free and united nation. And this we are fast developing. When this has been fully developed, what can you do ? I do not for a moment imagine that you could find in all England a hundred men so hard-hearted and callous as to fire for long on unarmed and non-violent people ready to die for the freedom of their country. No ; I do not think so badly of English soldiers.

The real problem which is upsetting us all the time has been the third problem—the Hindu-Muslim problem ; but that is no problem at all. The fact is that the Hindu-Muslim difficulty, like the Army difficulty, is of your own creation. But not altogether. It is the old maxim of "divide and rule". But there is a division of labour here. We divide and *you* rule. The moment we decide not to divide you will not be able to rule as you are doing to-day. With this determination not to be divided we have come here. Let me assure every British man and woman who thinks of shaping our destinies that the only quarrel between the Hindus and the Muslims to-day is quarrel that the Muslim is afraid of Hindu domination and the Hindu, I suppose, is afraid of Muslim domination. (*Dr. Moonje*: No, the Hindu is never afraid.) Well I am very glad to hear that. In my country the she-buffalo attacks only when she is afraid and whatever the reverence of the Hindu for the cow, I am glad he has never the fear of the she-buffalo. I want to get rid of that fear. The very fact that Hindus and Muslims are quarrelling to-day shows that they will not stand British domination either for one single minute. That is the point to grasp. British domination is doomed over India. Is our friendship doomed also ? My brother took service under the Government and served it for 17 years, but he did one thing for me. He sent me to Oxford. He was always taunting me in the non-co-operation days by saying : "You have a soft corner in your heart for that place called Oxford." I must admit that I had. I spent four years there, and I always carry with me the most pleasant recollections of that time, and I want to keep that feeling. I do have a very soft corner in my heart for my Alma Mater. But I can taunt my brother, too. When he was being

tried at Karachi—when the jury let us off, and there was a British juryman among them, they voted for our release because we were such a sporting lot—my big brother said: "Even if it becomes my duty to kill the first Englishman I come across, if he happens to have blue eyes, my knife will not work, because I shall think of the eyes of Theodore Beck, my late Principal at my old College, Aligarh." There are several Aligarh Old Boys here, and they can bear witness to the fact that we who were brought up at Aligarh by Beck could never be without a soft corner in our hearts for Englishmen. Therefore, even if British domination is doomed—and it must be killed here—do not let us kill British friendship. We have a soft corner in our hearts for Great Britain. Let us retain it, I beseech you.

One word as to the Muslim position, with which I shall deal at length on some other occasion. Many people in England ask us why this question of Hindu and Muslim comes into politics, and what it has to do with these things. I reply, "It is a wrong conception of religion that you have, if you exclude politics from it. It is not dogma; it is not, ritual! Religion, to my mind, means the interpretation of life." I have a culture, a polity, an outlook on life—a complete synthesis which is Islam. Where God commands I am a Muslim first, a Muslim second, and a Muslim last, and nothing but a Muslim. If you ask me to enter into your Empire or into your Nation by leaving that synthesis, that polity, that culture, that ethics, I will not do it. My first duty is to my maker, not to H. M. the King, nor to my companion Dr. Moonje; my first duty is to my Maker, and that is the case with Dr. Moonje also. He must be a Hindu first, and I must be a Muslim first, so far as that duty is concerned. But where India is concerned, where India's freedom is concerned, where the welfare of India is concerned, I am an Indian first, an Indian second, an Indian last, and nothing but an Indian.

I belong to two circles of equal size, but which are not concentric. One is India, and the others the Muslim world. When I came to England in 1920 at the head of the Khilafat Delegation, my friends said: "You must have some sort of a crest for your stationery." I decided to have it with two circles on it. In one

circle was the word "India"; in the other circle was Islam, with the word "Khilafat." We as Indian Muslims came in both circles. We belong to these two circles, each of more than 300 millions, and we can leave neither. We are not nationalists but supernationalists, and I as a Muslim say that "God made man and the Devil made the nation." Nationalism divides; our religion binds. No religious wars, no crusades, have seen such holocausts and have been so cruel as your last war, and that was a war of your nationalism, and not my *Jehad*.

But where our country is concerned, where the question of taxation is concerned, where our corps are concerned, where the weather is concerned, where all associations in those thousands of matters of ordinary life are concerned, which are for the welfare of India, how can I say "I am a Muslim and he is a Hindu"? Make no mistake about the quarrels between Hindu and Muslim; they are founded only on the fear of domination. If there is one other sin with which I charge Great Britain, in addition to the sin of emasculating India, it is the sin of making wrong histories about India and teaching them to us in our schools, with the result that our schoolboys have learnt wrong Indian history. The quarrels which are sometimes visible in our streets on certain holidays or quarrels the motives of which have been instilled into the hearts of our so-called intelligentsia—I call it unintelligentsia—by the wrong history taught us in our schools for political purposes. If that feeling, which writes "Revenche" so large over the politics of certain people in India, existed as it does, and if it existed to the extend which it does to-day, and the Muslims were everywhere in a minority of 25 per cent and the Hindus were everywhere in a minority of 66 per cent. I could see no ray of hope to-day; but thanks to the jerrymandering of our saints and our soldiers, if there are Provinces like that of my friend Dr. Moonje, in which I am only 4 per cent, there are other Provinces where I am 93 per cent, as in the Province of my friend Nawab Sir Abdul Qaiyum, for which we demand equal freedom. There is the old Province of Sind, where the Muslims first landed, where they are 73 per cent; in the Punjab they are 56 per cent, and in Bengal 55 per cent. That gives us our safeguard, for

we demand hostages as we have willingly given hostages to Hindus in the other Provinces where they form huge majorities.

I want you to realise that for the first time you are introducing a big revolution into India; for the first time majority rule is to be introduced into India. In the days of Lord Rama there was no majority rule, or he would not have been exiled. The old Pandu and Kuru rulers, who gambled their kingdoms away, did not have majority rule; Mahmud of Ghazni and Akbar and Aurangzeb did not have majority rule, nor did Shivaji; when Ranjit Singh ruled in the Punjab, he too did not have majority rule; when Warren Hastings and Clive ruled India, they did not have majority rule; and even in the days of Lord Irwin there is no majority rule. For the first time in India we are going to introduce majority rule, and I, belonging to a minority community, accept that majority rule, although I know very well that if 51 people say that 2 and 2 make 5, and 49 people say that 2 and 2 make 4, the fact that 51 say that 2 and 2 make 5 does not cause them to make 5. Still I am prepared to submit to majority rule. Luckily, however, there are Muslim majorities in certain Provinces, and with the federal form of government which is suited to India, not only for the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem, but is essential for the sake of the Princes also, this is in our favour. The centrifugal and centripetal tendencies are so well balanced in India that we are bound to have a federal system of government there, not as a distant ideal, as the Government of India says, but to-day, now, this minute. We shall leave this conference only with federation established in India, with new treaties made with the Princes, with the consent of the Crown and the Princes.

I sometimes here it said that nothing can be done without the consent of the Princes. No, Your Highnesses, we, Our doLownesses, will nothing without your consent. But when, at the end of 1857, the powers of the East India Campany were transferred to the Crown, nobody ever thought of asking for your consent. There was not so much as "By your leave." Your relationship with the Crown was established merely *ipso facto*, but it was with a family of Kings and Queens who were really

good people, many of whom worshipped their conscience as their King, and it is that which gives us hope.

One more word and I have done. I wish to say just this about the Army. I am giving away a secret in regard to the Army now. When ten years ago, H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught was sent out to India to open the Indian Legislature, Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru and myself were invited by our late lamented dear friend C. R. Das, whom our eyes seek in vain to-day at this Table, and who would have brought Motilal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi also to this Table had he been alive to-day, for he was a man of imagination. Gandhiji and I were putting up together as the guests of Das, and I was acting as Lord Chamberlain to Mahatma Gandhi. Any number of people were coming to see Mahatma Gandhi and to touch his feet—I wish he had had the feet of a centipede, but even then he could not have coped with the thousands who came to touch his feet—and in trying to satisfy them and spare Gandhiji, too, as much as possible, my life was a misery. Amongst these people I saw 10 or 12 tall turbaned men, not in uniform, but looking and dressed very much alike. I thought they were members of the C.I.D. from the Punjab. My belief, after my arrest and internment in 1915 on the report of a spy neighbour, is that there is no place where God and the British C.I.D. are not present, so that whatever I say and whatever I do, I say and do in the belief that God Almighty and the British spy are equally omnipresent! I went up to these supposed British spies, and I said: "What can I do for you? I have been doing a lot for the C.I.D. by way of sedition and I should like to do something more." They said: "We do not belong to the C.I.D.; we belong to the Army." "Then what," I asked, "are you doing in this seditious house?" They said: "We have come to pay our respects to Mahatma Gandhi; we belong to the escort that has been brought from Poona for the Duke of Connaught. I said if they wanted to see Mahatma Gandhi I would take them in straightaway. Mahatma Gandhi asked them whether they were interested in Swaraj, and they said: "Yes." Out of respect for the British Indian Army, I will now stand up and repeat their words. Gandhiji said to them: "Are you inter-

ested in Swaraj, you who belong to the Army, and who have been brought as an escort all the way from Poona because they cannot trust the people of Bengal, their first Presidency, for the safety of the Duke of Connaught?" They said, "Only the other day our Colonel on parade told us laughingly something about you, Gandhiji, saying, 'Do you know that bunia, Gandhi, wants Swaraj for India?' and he laughed, and asked us: 'Do you also want Swaraj?' Of course he expected we would all say 'No, Sir,' but the regiment very quietly said 'Yet, Sir, we also want Swaraj for India.' Then the Colonel, who was terribly shocked, asked them why they wanted Swaraj, and they told him that when they were sent to fight in Europe, even when they saw Belgian soldiers coming back after a defeat, these soldiers would pull themselves up and proudly reply to anyone who asked who they were, 'We are Belgians; we belong to the Army of Belgium.' Sometimes the French came running back but if anybody asked them who they were, they drew themselves up and replied with pride that they belonged to the Army of France. It was the same with the British; but these men said that, even when they had won and had saved the French coast at a critical moment in October, 1914, when anybody asked them who they were, they could not say with equal pride that they belonged to the Army of India; they had to say. 'We are British subjects. We belong to the Army of the British Sirkar.' Now these men said that they too wanted to stand upright and be able to say, 'We belong to the Army of India!'" I tell you this is the fact, God's own truth, about the Indian Army. You take a plebiscite of the Indian Army, God Almighty being present, and the British spies, of course, being also present, but some of us also being present, and you will find that we know more than anybody else on that subject India will defend herself to-day if you honestly want her to do so.

The Government of India Despatch goes further than Sir John Simon's Report and says that the Army should not be under the control of the Government of England but under the Government of India. There are the Members of the Government of India the pigment of whose skin is the same as mine, and in some cases even darker. Two of them were my stable companions of Eng-

land as students, and the third also studied here at that time. If these people can control the Army, why cannot Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru as Prime Minister of India? Why cannot Sir Muhammad Shafi or Mr. Jinnah be Prime Minister of India, and control the Indian Army? Or why cannot even a humble man like myself or my big brother become the Commander-in-Chief of India? I have no doubt exhausted your patience, but I can assure you my speech has been, so far as I too am concerned, both exhausting and exhausive. I now take my seat and I hope I shall not be called upon to speak again in the Plenary Conference until you announce, Mr. Chairman, that India is as free as England.

THE LAST LETTER

Written to the Prime Minister of England on 1st January 1931, from Hyde Park Hotel, London. Two days later Mohamed Ali breathed his last.

The letter was dictated in absolute defiance of the doctors and represents Mohamed Ali's last desperate bid to find a solution of Hindu-Muslim problem.

XV

THE LAST LETTER

I AM far too ill as I said in my opening speech in the Plenary Conference to have come to the Indian Round Table Conference, and the work and more particularly the worry through which I have been passing have without exaggeration nearly killed me as my doctors would tell you. On the 19th of December I fell unconscious and remained so for more than 24 hours. While my pulse was 140, my temperature was only 97 and went down to 95 and my respiration was 30 yet my desire for doing the work which had brought me here was so great that I invited the Lord Chancellor to breakfast at 8 o'clock that *evening* believing it to be the *morning*. He very kindly came the next day; but my brother allowed him to interview me only for 10 minutes, and even in that short time it was with great difficulty that I could express myself.

It is with a desire to place my views on record before His Majesty's Government and before the British Parliamentary delegates as well as the Indian delegates (who to some extent already know my views) that I have solicited the favour of your kindly sending me my old friend Sir Geoffrey Corbett of Chhindwara fame to be present when notes could be taken down of what I said on the subject of my views about minorities of which committee I am a member.

In the first place it is a misnomer to call the Hindu-Muslim question a question of minorities. There are certainly minorities in India, and we must provide for them in such a way that they should feel that the future Government of India is not going to be a Government only for one or two communities, but the Government of all Indians irrespective of creed and caste. Nevertheless the one hitch in the way of the recognition of India's responsibility with a government of her own is the question not

of these minorities but the deepseated differences that divide the Hindus and the Muslims. The fact is so obvious that I need not go into history, nor even present statistics; but I wish to emphasise one or two points which will distinguish the case of Hindus and Muslims from the case of the minorities. First of all the Muslims ruled over India from the beginning of the 8th century to about the middle of the 19th, in one way or another, and in one region or another, which no other community can claim in the same manner. The Sikh rule for a generation in the solitary province of the Punjab, the result of an accident—I say this without any derogation of the valour of the Sikhs and of the high respect I feel for their organization as a panth—nor the depredations of the Mahrattas and their confederacy, are any parallel to the history of the Muslims in India. Whether by conquest or by diplomacy the Muslim rule had passed finally from the hands of the Muslims to those of the British, barring of course the rule of the Indian States, many of which remain from time immemorial, great and distinguished Hindu principalities tracing their origin even from the sun and the moon. Whatever the relations of the Muslim power as suzerain or as the paramount power to these Hindu States, there is not the least doubt that they retained not only for the most part a deep feeling of loyalty towards the Muslim power, but also a degree of independence which they have more recently lost since the transference of Muslim power into British hands. Other States are, of course, the creation of the times during the break-up of the Mughal Empire which have been recognised by the British. Some, like Hyderabad, were larger powers at the time of the original treaties than the East India Company of which they became faithful allies and others were smaller, but with that I am not at present concerned. What I desire to sketch is that rightly or wrongly the Muslim community ruled over India in one way or another from the 8th to the middle of the 19th century in some part of the country or another and that no other community has anything like that record.

A very important result of that which we have to deal to-day is the feeling created by the record of Muslim rule for so long over so large a part of India. There is hardly a community that

has not a real or an imaginary grievance against the old Muslim rulers and what we know of human nature elsewhere brings it home to us that even to-day there is a feeling of "revanche" harboured against the Muslims in the minds of some Hindus and some members of other community whether Sikh or Mahratta or Rajput. It is with this feeling that we must deal, and against which we must provide safeguards for the future when framing a constitution for an ideal Indian Government in which all would feel safe, equal and free.

The next consideration is that the Muslims constitute not a minority in the sense in which the last war and its sequel have habituated us to consider European minorities. The League of Nations deals with minorities and our Indian savants and professors easily borrow maxims from the League of Nations and its dealings with minorities and with mandates and want to guide India from Geneva when in reality it is India itself that can provide far better guidance for Geneva. A community that in India alone must now be numbering more than 70 millions cannot easily be called a minority in the sense of Geneva minorities, and when it is remembered that this community numbers nearly 400 millions of people throughout the world, whose ambition is to convert the rest of mankind to their way of thought and their outlook on life, and who claim and feel a unique brotherhood; to talk of it as a minority is a mere absurdity.

Keeping these two main facts in mind let us now proceed with the problem that we have before us. It was proposed by a member of the Hindu Mahasabha in the Round Table Conference delegation that the Prime Minister should act as an arbitrator between the two communities, which was no doubt very flattering to the Prime Minister, but which would have made his position far too invidious, and he naturally declined the offer with thanks, and I feel certain that he must have seen through the motive that prompted the suggestion. We have heard suggestions of the matter being referred to the League of Nations. That would mean washing the dirty lines of India before the whole world. As it is, we are disgusted with fact that the Indian Round Table Conference has been made the *Dhobi Talao* (the washerman's tank) of Indian communalism. This question should have been settled

in India. We who worked for ten years through thick and thin with Gandhiji pressed that upon him, but the desire of retaining Hindu popularity for himself and for Pandit Motilal Nehru (who, I am sorry, is absent) prevented a settlement. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru tried his utmost to have a Hindu-Muslim settlement when the Congress at our urgent request in December 1928 failed to do so and Sir A. P. Patro was most keen. But the Hindu Mahasabha pretended to share this desire with the Liberal Hindus and the Muslims at first and after postponing meeting after meeting absolutely refused to take any part in the Conference at Bombay and Dr. Moonje was quite frank about his refusal to do anything to arrive at a settlement in India before the Round Table Conference. The Congress followed the Hindu Mahasabha in refusing even to come to the Round Table Conference for a settlement when a settlement was inevitable before an Indian constitution could be framed. But three members of the Hindu Mahasabha nevertheless came over, and in spite of every effort of Muslim and the Hindu Liberals have defeated the settlement so far. It is not for me to say how much time they have usurped in all these conciliatory talks both among the Hindus and Muslims themselves and with the Prime Minister. I think the Prime Minister can judge that better for himself. Now that a formal committee has been formed for this purpose it is essential that the case for a settlement should be clearly stated.

In the first place, I would like with the greatest courtesy and friendliness to warn the Prime Minister that it is not a case of the Punjab or Bengal, as he seems to imagine, nor of reducing the figure of 110 in the Punjab to 100 or anything like it, as he seems to think when he was making his conciliatory efforts at the Chequers. The entire question is, as I suggested in my speech in the Plenary Conference, that for the first time in the history of India we intend to introduce into India majority rule, and those who have been usurping the control of the destinies of those called Hindus for so many thousands of years do not want that there should be any majority Indian or Hindu except that which they can control precisely as they have controlled the Hindus for thousands of years. Let me add that there is one important difference. Sir John Simon is somewhat out of date when he

refers like the late Sir Valentine Chirol to Brahman rule. The Brahman had at least taught the people and had at least the mistaken notion that he brought salvation to people in the next world. The small monopolistic caste that desires to remain in control of the destinies of the Hindu community and that being the majority community of the Indian nation as a whole through it,—is the case not so much of Dr. Moonje and Raja Narendra Nath, but of the *bania* who has no conception of the salvation of anybody in the next world, nor even of the teaching of anyone in this. I am more anxious than any Indian perhaps to anyone of the foreign incubus, if I may be forgiven to say so, of "a nation of shopkeepers" controlling our destinies. But as I wrote to His Excellency the Viceroy in reply to the invitation of His Majesty's Government to me to this Conference, I do not wish to create a home-made incubus of a caste of shopkeepers of our own. To my mind most of the agitation to-day is being financed —and partly for selfish reasons by the *banias* of Bombay and Gujerat, and although I have always laughingly said I do not care a tupenny damn for 1/4 or 1/6, the fight to-day is not so much for the freedom of India as for 1/4 against 1/6. This may be entirely justified but it is not the fight for India's freedom in its larger sense.

Now to deal with the Hindu-Muslim problem. It is not a provincial question. In every province Hindu and Muslim sentiment *vis-a-vis* each other is more or less the same. The Muslims lost the control of India nearly three generations ago and the British gained it mostly from the Muslims, though to some extent from the Mahrattas who were the Mayors of the Palace in Delhi and partly from the Sikhs in the Punjab whom the British themselves encouraged to rule there against the Muslims because of their own war with Afghanistan. Now India wants to regain that control, and the Nuslims, as we showed ten years ago, have not been lacking in self-sacrifice for this purpose. To-day some Muslims are still taking part in the Congress movement, but they are men who are doing it more out of the habit of freedom than otherwise. Many have kept away from the movement of Civil Disobedience as they had kept away from non-co-operation ten years ago, even when Turkey was involved in the question. Without

exaggerating our own importance we can say that it is not these people, many of whom have been selected as delegates to the Indian Round Table Conference by His Majesty's Government or by the Government of India, or by Local Governments and officers—whoever does it—that have exercised much influence in keeping the Muslims away from joining the Congress again as they did with us ten years ago. Even though we have to say it, it is we who had to fight the battle practically in every province, and to a very large extent indeed we succeeded in keeping the Muslims out, because we showed to them that the last movement was a truly national movement, while in the present movement I regret have to say in their absence, Gandhiji and Pandit Motilal Nehru have both surrendered for the sake of their popularity to the Hindu Mahasabha. Now that we have come here, I am the only representative of my party—in spite of my long correspondence with His Excellency the Viceroy on the subject while I was lying ill in India before the final selection was made—to represent it in the Round Table Conference, and more than any one else among the Muslims it will be I—and of course my brother—who on our return will be asked by the millions of Muslims what we have brought back for the Muslims. Well, we want to go back not with separate electorates only, not with weightage only for the Muslims but with freedom for India including freedom for the Muslims and unless we can secure that, I can assure the Prime Minister that the Muslims of India will join the Civil Disobedience Movement without least hesitation no matter what we may say and what the other Muslim Delegates may say.

Freedom for India is not separate electorates, though being one of the authors of the separate electorates in 1906, I shall be the last to surrender them. Let me first say what is the use of separate electorates. A separate electorate gives to the Muslim client in the case he is fighting the counsel that he selects himself and can trust. In every law court every client is permitted to do that even though sometimes he is provided with counsel at Government expense. The other party is certainly never allowed to choose his counsel for him. If there had been an independent and impartial judge all that we would have needed would have

been a trustworthy counsel, and that was just that was provided a generation ago for us so wisely by Lords Morley and Minto. There was no idea in the mind of Lord Morley to give Indian anything but a Parliamentary British Government. There was the official bloc. There was in the Government of India the British official majority and it was admittedly kept there to show that there was no idea of the introduction of Parliamentary Government into India. Each community presented its case as a client before the judge and it was the judge that decided. We could only influence, never guide and advise him. Therefore all that was needed was a trustworthy counsel selected by the client himself which we did through the separate electorates.

Even then somehow by accident, if not by design, Lord Minto had provided not only for the needs of the present, but also something for the prospects of the future. The separate electorates had been provided only to *supplement*, though to a very large extent, the deficiency that the Muslims were expected to encounter through the narrowness of the Hindu majority in their representation through the general territorial electorates. Lord Morley had not deprived the Muslims of their share in the mixed electorates themselves. That was a fatal mistake that was made at the urgent suggestion of our Hindu friends in 1916 at Lucknow when we two brothers were interned in Chhindwara and could take no part in the politics of the Lucknow Muslim League and the Congress. For the first time separate electorates became the only resource for Muslim representation.

Another grave mistake, that was then made, for which the Muslims have now been crying for the last 14 years was the substitution of Muslim minorities in the Punjab and in Bengal for the small Muslim majorities. Had our friends the least vision of the future they would not have given the Punjab a practical and Bengal a deliberate and a small minority. It is to *rectify these mistakes that the Round Table Conference is practically being held. Let here be no mistake about it.* This is what His Majesty's Government and the Prime Minister should primarily understand. It is with this that I should have begun this long dissertation; but I am glad I have come to it now after *clearing the site for laying down the foundation* and I will not take

very long being is. The real problem before us is to give full power to Muslims in such provinces as those in which they are in a majortity, whether small or large, and protection to them in such provinces as those in which they are in a minority, and in order to be absolutely fair to the Hindu community also, precisely the same thing must be done with the Hindus. What is needed is to give power to a community which is in majority in any province no matter how small or how large it may be, and protection to it in a province no matter how large or small it may be. The Muslims desire—*and this is the crux of their 14 points and* not *separate electorates*—that there should be federal government so that the central unity Government with a permanent Hindu majority should not override them everywhere; that they should have at least a third of the British Indian representation in the Federal Government, that in the provinces of the Punjab and Bengal where they have small majorities in population which are unorganised, and greatly controlled by the banyas and the Sikhs and the Hindu landlords, as in Bengal, those majorities should be reserved (personally I shall be satisfied if for a number of years only such as 20); that in the N.-W.F.P. and in Baluchistan (which is only nominally a Province) where there are clearly huge Muslim majorities full reforms should be extended to the Muslims which have so far been denied by the combination of British, military and civil domination and Hindu narrowness characteristically supporting it, and that Sind should be made a separate small province like Assam; and that the Muslims should be allowed to have their majorities in all these as the Hindus have everywhere else. Unless in these few provinces Muslim majorities are established by the new constitution, I submit, not as a threat, but as a very humble and friendly warning, there will be civil war in India. *Let there be no mistake about that.* These are the four or five Provinces where the Muslims should have precisely the same *power* as the Hindus have everywhere else, and the Hindus should have the same protection as the Muslims demand where they are in minorities.

In the Punjab and Bengal where the Muslim majorities are only 6 and 5 it is *absolutely impossible* to give any weightage to the Sikhs or to the Europeans, and neither of them needs weight-

age, as I shall presently explain. The whole idea has been created in order to rob the Muslims of their small majorities in the only two large Provinces where their population gives it to them. The franchise in both these Provinces, *whether equal for all communities or not*—this is not a religious or an ethical question about which there should be no rigidity and no fetish, and at present there is no rigidity about the franchise about the different communities in India (compare the franchise about the Council of State to-day)—should be such as to give the Muslims as many voters at least as their population ratio, and in any case their seats should at least for 20 years be reserved in the same proportion for them because they are indebted to the Hindu banyas and too much under the influence of the Sikh *nouveau richi.* The Nehru Report very ingeniously tried to fool the Muslims by talking of adult franchise. Nobody can be more in favour of adult franchise than a true Muslim. But fortunately or unfortunately women become adults as well as men, and for 20 years at least Muslim women when they become adults will not go to the polling booths even if the most strict *purdah* arrangements are made for them, and only *purdah* officers supervise over their voting. In comparison with the Aryas, other Hindus and Sikhs in the Punjab, the Muslim women are bound to suffer. Therefore adult franchise is out of the question. In these two Provinces of the Punjab and Bengal, no consideration should go against the Muslim demand of a majority of 56 per cent and 55 per cent. respectively in the entire House.

The Sikhs had acquired in that one generation of rule so much land in the Punjab and they exercise such control over the poor tenants and others in the villages to this day, that they need absolutely no protection. Time after time they have themselves said that if the Muslims give up "communalism" in the interests of "nationalism," they too would give up communalism and abide by the result of the general territorial elections. Robbed of all false sentiment this means that they do not need protection in the same way as the Muslims do, and therefore the idea of providing weightage for them is wholly unnecessary and is a Hindu Mahasabha fiction.

The same may be said of the Europeans in Bengal. It is

not for a few seats more or less in the Bengal Council only that they would keep their control over commerce that they have acquired since the John Company. We must provide for that in some other way, and I suggest that the Instrument of Instructions for the Governor of Bengal should provide that nothing should be done in India to wreak revenge against Europeans whatever Indians may feel for the past. A mere weightage of 3 or 10 per cent will not help them. It will be absolutely ineffective. What it will do will be to rob the Muslims of their majority in another of the only two provinces in which at present they are a majority in the population and have reforms.

With regard to the Frontier Province I say nothing, because the Frontier Committee is already dealing with the matter and my own suggestion is that the Muslims should give the Hindus and the Sikhs not only twice as much representations at the latter's population but three times as much, so that the Hindus and the Sikhs should feel that the province is their own as well as the Muslims and that they have a share in the government of the Province. That is the kind of thing that the Muslim should feel in Dr. Moonje's Province where he is only 4 per cent or in Madras where he is only 7 per cent or in Orissa when it is to be separated when he will be in an equally small proportion. *It must be remembered that the feeling for or against the Muslims in every Province is practically the same*, and when it is so bitter in the Punjab it is not likely to be less bitter in Provinces like Dr. Moonje's where he is in very small numbers and practically a Hindu Government will rule over him. *The fear is that the idea of revenge is too much in the minds of our young men who have been mistaught Indian History chiefly for political reasons.*

It is only in the Indian States where history is not taught but is still being made by the Princes and made in a human manner in spite of the weakness of Princes, to which I must refer as a confirmed republican, that true protection is offered to be found for the Muslims.

Let me in passing refer to the fact that the Muslim has not been made excessively popular to any other minority either by 1,250 years of rule that he has exercised. Some have a grievance against him because he conquered Persia! Some have a grievance

against him because he conquered Byzantium, Syria and Egypt and did not lose Palestine in the Crusades! At any rate, whosoever has ruled over India, whether it be the English, or the Muslim, is bound in some way to suffer from real or imaginary grievances of his old subjects. It is remarkable that the Muslim suffers much less from it than the British. The British can be the best judge of this feeling of revenge against him, and in making a new constitution they must provide against that feeling for at least a number of years.

I come now to the subject of protection for the minorities. Many of the 14 points provide for this, such as a veto given to two-thirds of the Hindu and Muslim minorities in any legislative or other elected body against the discussion or passage of any bill, resolution, or part thereof, which is considered by it to be against its *interests*. This is the historic provision made by the Congress when the late Sir Syed Ahmad Khan of Aligarh was being invited in 1887 to join the Congress by Mr. Badruddin Tyabji, the other distinguished Muslim who had joined the Congress. A provision that the Parliament of India before it was recognised and had say any real power except to debate, willingly legislated should not now be objected to when the Parliament of India is being recognised and being given effective power. *I insist that the words should be copied from the Congress Constitution itself.*

It must be remembered that this provision is not for the protection of any *religion* but of *communal interests* only. *Religion* must be above law, and I am sorry I had just been out of the Plenary Committee when the Prime Minister asked us about the Federal Committee's report whether we should note the point that no legislation should be introduced affecting the religion or religious rites and usages of any of His Majesty's subjects without the previous assent of the Governor. Already much mischief has been done by that provision no account of the passage of the Sarda Act for which, although it had been passed, no assent was ever taken, the assent being given for a purely Hindu Bill as originally introduced. I have not the least objection if the Hindus or members of any other progressive religion desire to legislate about their religions. But my religion is not "progressive." It claims divine legislation, as I have shown in the statement pre-

seated on the 9th November 1929, to His Excellency the Viceroy by the deputation of Muslim Ulama and leaders which I led before His Excellency of which I submit a copy with this statement of mine. Matters of such importance must not be rushed through in such hurry, *and when opportunity arises again I shall see to it that at least Muslim religion is placed above human legislation whether by the Indian or by the British Parliament. Without that no Muslim can undertake to be loyal to any constitution.*

I would say one word only with reference to the weightage that the Muslims enjoy and desire to enjoy in every province where they are in such meagre minorities. Nowhere does that weightage give them a majority. As Shakespeare says about the Jews, it can be said of minorities that sufferance is the badge of the tribe! But everywhere weightage gives them a certain amount of influence. And the need of that influence is realised by no one more than by myself who, through my illness, have had the whole of my party unrepresented in the Minorities Committee and elsewhere at present. Weightage will give to the community so represented only the idea that it has a share in the governance of the country and no more. The same weightage that the Muslims claim they are prepared to give to the Hindus in every Province in which the Hindus are in a similar minority. But to claim weightage for the Hindus of Bengal or of the Punjab where the minority is in reality better organised and in every way more powerful politically than the majority more wealthy and better educated is an absurdity. The same is true of the Sikhs in the Punjab, who, apart from every other consideration, are socially Hindus and have politically been working with them. In Sind the Hindu minority is better organised and richer and better educated than the Muslims in spite of their being big landlords, and yet I would give them a weightage as large as could satisfy the biggest *gourmand.*

Let it not be understood that I am a communalist in the sense in which communalism has been understood in Europe. Although nearly a generation ago I was one of the authors of the separate electorate. I have felt that the time for it has passed, and that we should now have, in the interest of Indian nationalism, a mixed territorial electorate. *But a territorial electorate in India*

of the type of England is an absurdity. In the province, say of Dr. Moonje, or of Nawab Sir Abdul Qayum, where the minority communities number only 4 and 7 per cent respectively, the minorities have no chance of getting their true representatives elected even if 20 seats are reserved for them, if 96 % or 93 % of the rival community are to be allowed to choose their representatives. Men of straw, men who are merely religiously Hindu or Muslim, but not *politically* so, will be returned by the votes of *politically* Muslim and Hindu majorities.

I have therefore after long cogitation and consultation with friends devised a plan. It is certainly far more deserving of consideration than Major Atlee's plan discussed in the Simon Report. It is this. Let the seats be reserved for the two communities but let no candidate be declared elected unless he secures:

(1) At least 40 per cent of votes cast of his own community:

(2) At least 5 per cent of the votes cast of other communities wherever he is in a minority of 10 or less per cent and 10 per cent where he is in a larger minority or in a majority.

In this way *three* purposes will be served. In the *first* instance, every candidate will have to go cap in hand to both the communities as in the Minto-Morley Reforms which he does not do to-day; and the rank abuse of sister communities which goes on to-day since the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, which had ruined Indian politics, and even social life, will cease. *Secondly*, no man would be returned to represent any community who does not represent at least a fair percentage of that community though not necessarily its majority as in the separate electorates to-day. The *third* purpose which is no less important is that ordinarily no person who is not in the least a *persona grata* to a sister community will be able to get returned even if he secures election from his own community. *Thus for the first time communalism will be killed* and true nationalism will get a chance. This is better than P.R. and distinctly better than the "list system." If, however, no candidate from a constituency satisfies either of these minima, the one that secures the largest votes cast of the community for which the seat is reserved must be returned. This will only be the relic of the present separate electorates which is unfortunate-

ly inevitable to-day. I do not want any more than that portion of separate electorates to be spared in the new national constitution that we are trying to frame this time in England. Without those conditions Muslims will never accept mixed electorates in which a man of straw or even a false convert can be returned by the votes of 96 per cent of the majority community in any province irrespective of tne entire opposition of the community for which the candidate is standing for election as a representative. That will be an absurdity worse than any we have known.

I have explained this system both to His Excellency the Viceroy and to the Secretary of State for India and they were very gravely impressed with the sanity and ingenuity of the measure I proposed. I believe I have a right to mention that Sir T.B. Sapru and the Right Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri have been equally impressed if not more.

With these words I close this statement of mine which has been dictated through the kindness of the Prime Minister and Sir Geoffrey Corbett in absolute defiance of my doctors who are greatly displeased with the liberty I have taken, and yet if I had not taken this liberty I should have disobeyed them still more greatly and would have gone to the Conference to put this case before the Committee and the Conference even if I died. I beg the Prime Minister and the Committee not to ignore this lengthy *screed* but to give it some consideration at least. I can assure them that it represents the views of *mauy scores of millions of Muslims* whose voice may not be heard in the Indian Round Table Conference but whose sentiments cannot be ignored by the Indian administrators as I feel sure Sir Geoffrey Corbett who has been present throughout knows well enough himself.

THE END

OUR PUBLICATIONS

QURAN

THE HOLY QUR-AN, Arabic text with English translation, and commentary by Allama Abdullah Yusuf Ali
Available in one volume, two volumes and three volumes

AN ENGLISH INTERPRETATION OF THE HOLY QUR-AN, English translation by Allama Abdullah Yusuf Ali with full Arabic text, but without footnotes, running commentary and appendices. In small handy size

AN APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF THE QURAN, by Nawab Sir Nizamat Jung Bahadur

PHILOSOPHY OF THE QUR'AN, by Hafiz Ghulam Sarwar

QUR'ANIC LAWS, by Muhammad Valibhai Merchant

PROPHECIES OF THE HOLY QUR'AN, by Q. I. Hingora

A GEOGRAPHICAL HISTORY OF THE QUR'AN, by S. Muzaffar ad-Din Nadvi

THE MESSAGE OF ISLAM (Bird's eye-view of the contents of the Holy Qur-an), by Allama A. Yusuf Ali

LESSONS FROM THE STORIES OF THE QUR'AN, by A.M.R. Muhajir

MUHAMMAD AND TEACHINGS OF QUR'AN, by John Davenport

ASH-SHAFI'I'S RISALAH (BASIC IDEAS), by Dr. Khalil Semaan

TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THE QUR'AN, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

THE QUR'AN : Shaykh Tabarsi's Commentary, by Musa O.A. Abdul

HADITH

SAHIH MUSLIM, English translation by M. Abdul Hamid Siddiqi, Four volumes

MISHKAT AL-MASABIH (AL-HADITH), English translation by Dr. James Robson, Two volumes

TA'WIL AL-AHADITH, by Shah Waliyullah, translated by G. N. Jalbani

SAYINGS OF MUHAMMAD (with Arabic text), translated by Professor Ghazi Ahmad

PRAYERS OF THE PROPHET (Masnun Du'a'ain, with Arabic Text), translated by A.H. Siddiqi

THUS SPOKE THE HOLY PROPHET, by Bennet and Brown

PRAYERS OF MUHAMMAD compiled and translated by A. H. Farid Available with and without Arabic text

AL-HIZB AL-AZAM (A collection of Prayers with Arabic Text), translated by M. Abdul Hamid Siddiqi

THE TABLE TALK OF MUHAMMAD by S. Lane-Poole

SAYINGS OF MUHAMMAD THE LAST PROPHET, compiled by S.A. Husain

ORATIONS OF MUHAMMAD by Maulana Muhammad Ubaidul Akbar

RELIGION, ISLAM, ETC.

THE MIRROR OF TRINITY, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

THE CREATION OF MAN, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

ISLAM OUR GUIDE, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

MODERN CHALLENGES TO MUSLIM FAMILIES, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

ROLE OF THE MOSQUE, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

THOUGHTS ON SOME ASPECTS OF ISLAM, by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

ISLAM AT THE CROSSROADS, by Muhammad Asad

SIN WITHOUT PLEASURE, by Muhammad Imran

MARXISM OR ISLAM, by Mazheruddin Siddiqi

INTRODUCTION TO ISLAM, by Dr. M. Hamidullah

MODERNIZATION MENACES MUSLIMS, by Aslam Siddiqi

VIRTUES OF SALAT, by Maulana Muhammad Zakaria

SALAT OR ISLAMIC PRAYER BOOK, with Arabic text and illustrations

ISLAM IN PRACTICAL LIFE, by A.M.R. Muhajir

MODERN ISLAM IN INDIA, by W.C. Smith

ISLAM AND THE WORLD, by S. Abul Hasan Ali Nadvi

THE PREACHING OF ISLAM, by Sir Thomas Arnold

TENETS OF ISLAM, by A.M.R. Muhajir

NOTES ON ISLAM, by Nawab Sir Amin Jung Bahadur

SUPPORT OF THE FAITH, Shah Ismail Shahid's *Taqwiyat-ul-Iman*, translated into English by Mir Shahamat Ali

PEARLS OF THE FAITH (or Islam's Rosary), by Sir Edwin Arnold

THE ESSENCE OF ISLAMIC TEACHINGS, by Syed Nawab Ali

GATEWAY TO ISLAM, by Saifuddin J. Aniff Doray, Four parts

MANIFESTO OF ISLAM, by Dr. M. Rafi-ud-Din

GLIMPSES OF ISLAM by Prince Agha Khan and Dr. Zaki Ali

THE REFORMS AND RELIGIOUS IDEAS OF SIR SAYYID AHMAD KHAN, by J.M.S. Baljon, Jr.

MAXIMS OF ALI, translated by J.A. Chapman

ISLAM AND AHMADISM, by Sir Muhammad Iqbal

QADIANISM : A CRITICAL STUDY, by S. Abul Hasan Ali Nadvi

HIS HOLINESS, by Phoenix, with Foreword by the late Maulana Zafar Ali Khan

ISLAM VERSUS AHMADIYYAH IN NIGERIA, by Ismail A. B. Balogun.

OUR CULTURE, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CHRISTIANITY & ISLAM, by Ulfat Aziz-us-Samad

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ISLAM AND OTHER RELIGIONS Muzaffar-ud-Din Nadvi

PREPARATION FOR THE HEREAFTER, by Muhammad Imran

PRAYER—FOR PROGRESS, by Abdul Razzaque

"LESSONS IN ISLAM" SERIES, Five parts

THE JUST BALANCE, by D.P. Brewster

SIN WITHOUT PLEASURE, by Muhammad Imran

MUSLIM HEROES OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, by S.M.H. Mashhoor

MUHAMMAD : UPON WHOM BE PEACE, by Shaikh Abdus Rahman Lats

THE LIGHTNING FLASH (Versified Life History of the Holy Prophet), by Qazi Abdul Qayyum

THE SHADOWLESS PROPHET OF ISLAM, by Syed Abdul Wahab

LIFE OF ABU BAKR (First Caliph of Islam), by Muhammad Habibur Rahman Khan Sherwani, translated by Dr. Moin-ul-Haq

UMAR THE GREAT (AL-FAROOQ), by Allama Shibli Numani, trans. by M. Zafar Ali Khan and Prof. M. Saleem. Two volumes

"HEROES OF ISLAM" SERIES, by Prof. Fazl Ahmad :

1. Muhammad—The Prophet of Islam
2. Abu Bakr, the first Caliph
3. Omar, the second Caliph
4. Othman, the third Caliph
5. Ali, the fourth Caliph
6. Khalid bin Walid
7. Muhammad bin Qasim
8. Mahmud of Ghazna
9. Aurangzeb Alamgir
10. Sultan Tippu
11. Aisha the Truthful
12. Husain the Great Martyr
13. Some Companions of the Prophet, Part I
14. Some Companions of the Prophet, Part II
15. Some Companions of the Prophet, Part III

IBN AL-ARABI, by S.A.Q. Husaini

IBN KHALDUN, HIS LIFE AND WORKS, by M.A. Enan

TADHKARATUL-AULIYA (MEMOIRS OF SAINTS), by Dr Bankey Behari

KHAWAJA GHARIB NAWAZ, by Dr. Zahurul Hassan Sharib

LIFE OF SHAH WALIYULLAH, by G.N. Jalbani

IBN AS-SIKKIT, by Dr. S.A. Ahmedali

LIFE AND WORKS OF NAWAB SIDDIQ HASAN KHAN OF BHOPAL, by Professor Saeedullah

JAMI : The Persian Mystic, by F. Hadland Davis

RUMI : The Persian Mystic, by F. Hadland Davis

THE SAINT OF JILAN, by S.A. Salik

FALCON OF SPAIN, by Dr. T.B. Irving

MY LIFE : A FRAGMENT (late Maulana Mohamad Ali), edited by Afzal Iqbal

WIVES OF THE PROPHENT, by Fida Hussain Malik

MEET MR. JINNAH, by A.A. Ravoof

MUSLIM HEROES OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, by S.M.H. Mashoor

PHILOSOPHY & MYSTICISM

AWARIF-UL-MA'ARIF, translation by H.W. Clarke

THE ELEMENTS OF ISLAMIC PHILOSOPHY, by Ali Mahdi Khan

MYSTIC TENDENCIES IN ISLAM. by M.M. Zuhur-ud-Din Ahmad

STUDIES IN TASAWWUF. by Khaja Khan

STUDIES IN MUSLIM PHILOSOPHY. by M. Saeed Sheikh

AL-GHAZALI ON DIVINE PREDICATES AND THEIR PROPERTIES, English translation by Abdu-r-Rahman Abu Zayd

IDEOLOGY OF THE FUTURE. by Dr. M. Rafi-ud-Din

MUSLIM THOUGHT AND ITS SOURCE, by Syed Muzaffar-ud-Din Nadvi

THE ETHICAL PHILOSOPHY OF AL-GHAZALI, by Muhammad Umaruddin

THE PANTHEISTIC MONISM OF IBN AL-'ARABI. by Dr. S.A.Q. Husaini

PHILOSOPHY OF FAQIRS. by Sir Amir Jung Bahadur

THE MUJADDID'S CONCEPTION OF TAUHID. by Dr. Burhan Ahmad Faruqi

THE SECRET OF ANA'L-HAQQ. translated by K.S. Khaja Khan

FUTUH AL-GHAIB (Revelation of the Unseen) of Hazrat Syed Abdul Qadir Jilani, translated by M. Aftabuddin Ahmad

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SUFIS. by A.J. Arberry

AN INTRODUCTION TO SUFI DOCTRINE. by Titus Burckhardt, translated by D.M. Matheson

THE SECRET ROSE GARDEN OF SA'D-UD-DIN MAHMUD SHABISTARI. translated by F. Lederer

THE IDEA OF PERSONALITY IN SUFISM. by R.A. Nicholson

THE MYSTICAL PHILOSOPHY OF MUHYID DIN IBN ARABI by A.E. Affifi

FAITH AND PRACTICE OF AL-GHAZALI. by W. Montgomery Watt

SOME MORAL AND RELIGIOUS TEACHINGS OF GHAZALI, by Syed Nawab Ali

THE BOOK OF KNOWLEDGE. translated by Dr. Nabih Amin Faris

THE MYSTRIES OF ALMSGIVING, translated by Dr. Nabih Amin Faris

THE MYSTERIES OF PURITY, translated by Dr. Nabih Amin Faris

THE MYSTERIES OF FASTING. translated by Dr. Nabih Amin Faris

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE ARTICLES OF FAITH, translated by Dr. Nabih Amin Faris

MUSIC. by Sufi Inayat Khan

THE ALCHEMY OF HAPPINESS (al-Ghazali's Kimiya-i-Sa'adat translated by Claud Field

THE CONFESSIONS OF AL-GHAZALI, by Claud Field

GHAZALI'S MISHKAT AL-ANWAR (The Niche for Lights), translated by W.H.T. Gairdner

TEACHINGS OF SHAH WALIYULLAH, by G.N. Jalbani

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ISLAM, by Khaja Khan

AL-KHAIR AL-KATHIR, by Shah Waliyullah, trans. by G.N. Jalbani

MYSTERIES OF WORSHIP IN ISLAM, by E. E. Calverley

THE JUST BALANCE (GHAZALI), by Brewster

HISTORY

JUSTICE IN HISTORICAL ISLAM, by Anwar Ahmad Qadri

ARAB ADMINISTRATION, by Dr. S.A.Q. Husaini

CONSTITUTION OF THE ARAB EMPIRE, by S.A.Q. Husaini

CHRISTIANITY IN HISTORY, by Ahmad D. Azhar

MUSLIM CONTRIBUTION TO SCIENCE AND CULTURE, by Muhammad Abdul Rahman Khan

THE ARAB CIVILIZATION, by Prof. Hell's *die Kultur der Araber*, trans. by S. Khuda Bakhsh

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF MUSLIM HISTORIOGRAPHY, by M.G. Rasul

MUSLIM CONTRIBUTION TO GEOGRAPHY, by Dr. Nafis Ahmad

SUCCESSION TO THE RULE IN ISLAM, by Dr. Anwar G. Chejne

ANECDOTES FROM ISLAM, by M. Ebrahim Khan

MUSLIM COLONIES IN FRANCE, NORTHERN ITALY AND SWITZERLAND, by H.K. Sherwani

THE ARAB NAVIGATION, by S. Sulaiman Nadvi

HEROIC DEEDS OF MUSLIM WOMEN, by S. Sulaiman Nadvi

CONFLICT OF EAST AND WEST IN TURKEY, by Halide Edib-Hanum

TURKISH EMPIRE (1288-1924), by Lord Eversley

OUR DECLINE AND ITS CAUSES, by Amir Shakib Arslan, translated by M.A. Shakoor

DECISIVE MOMENTS IN THE HISTORY OF ISLAM, by M.A. Enan

MUSLIM LEAGUE, YESTERDAY AND TODAY, by A.B. Rajput

ISLAM AND THE WEST, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

A STUDY OF HISTORY, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

INDO-ISRAEL RELATIONS, by Muhammad Tayyab

IQBAL

STUDIES IN IQBAL, by Syed Abdul Vahid

THE NEW ROSE GARDEN OF MYSTERY AND THE BOOK OF SLAVES. English translation of Iqbal's "Gulshan-i-Raz-i-Jadid" and "Bandagi Namah" by M. Hadi Hussain

THOUGHTS AND REFLECTIONS OF IQBAL, collected and edited by Syed Abdul Vahid

GLIMPSES OF IQBAL'S MIND AND THOUGHT, by Dr. H. H. Bilgrami

IQBAL AND THE RECENT EXPOSITION OF ISLAMIC POLITICAL THOUGHT, by Dr. Muhammad Aziz Ahmad

PERSIAN PSALMS, Iqbal's *Zabur-i-Ajam*, translated by A. J. Arberry

IQBAL'S EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, by M.G. Saiyidain

THE SECRETS OF THE SELF, translation of Iqbal's *Asrar-i-Khudi* by R.A. Nicholson

NOTES ON IQBAL'S ASRAR-I-KHUDI, edited by A. J. Arberry

RECONSTRUCTION OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ISLAM, by Allama Muhammad Iqbal

COMPLAINT AND ANSWER, Iqbal's *Shikwah* and *Jawab*, translated by A J. Arberry

METAPHYSICS OF IQBAL, by Dr. Ishrat Hasan Enver

IQBAL AS A THINKER, edited by Taj Muhammad Khayal

LETTERS OF IQBAL TO JINNAH

IQBAL : HIS LIFE & TIMES, by Dr. L.S. May

IQBAL AND THE THIRD WORLD, by Maulana Kausar Niazi

PAKISTAN

THE EVOLUTION OF INDO-MUSLIM THOUGHT AFTER 1857, by Dr. L.S. May

PAKISTAN : A CULTURAL UNITY, by F.S. Hassan Faizi

WHYS OF THE GREAT INDIAN CONFLICT, by M.A. Mehtar

PAKISTAN : A NATION, by El-Hamza

PAKISTAN AS AN ISLAMIC STATE, by Wilfred Cantwell Smith

PAKISTAN DEFINED, by Begum Firdaus Rizvi

A POLITICAL STUDY OF PAKISTAN, by Safdar Mahmood

THE DELIBERATE DEBACLE, by Dr. Safdar Mahmood

MUSLIM COOKING OF PAKISTAN, by S.A. Hussain

"PAKISTAN LITERATURE" SERIES

1. National States and National Minorities
2. The Communal Pattern of India
3. Some Aspects of Pakistan
7. Muslim Educational Problems
8. The Future Development of Islamic Policy
9. The Development of Islamic Culture in India
11. The Industrial Pakistan
13. Are the Indian Muslims a Nation ?

EDUCATING PAKISTAN, by Malik Zafar ul Hassan

STORY OF INDIAN AGGRESSION AGAINST PAKISTAN, by Dr. Khalid Ghaznavi

POLITICS

THE FIRST WRITTEN-CONSTITUTION IN THE WORLD (with Arabic Text), edited and translated by Dr. M. Hamidullah

SELECT WRITINGS AND SPEECHES OF MAULANA MOHAMED ALI, edited by Afzal Iqbal, Two volumes

STUDIES IN MUSLIM POLITICAL THOUGHT & ADMINISTRATION by Prof. H.K. Sherwani

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS OF MR. JINNAH, edited by Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, Two volumes

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE & EDUCATION

ARABIC MADE EASY, by Abul Hashim

WHY WE LEARN THE ARABIC LANGUAGE, by Dr. Sh. Inayatullah

THE CONTRIBUTION OF INDO-PAKISTAN TO ARABIC LITERATURE, by Dr. M.G. Zubaid Ahmad

ARABIC PHONETICS (IBN SINA'S RISALAH), translated by Dr. K.I. Semaan

ARABIAN WISDOM, translated by John Wortabet

THE BUSTAN OF SA'DI, translated by A.M. Edwardes

FOR PRICES & DESCRIPTION, ASK FOR A FREE COPY OF OUR DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE

SH. MUHAMMAD ASHRAF
KASHMIRI BAZAR - L... ORE

OUR STOCKISTS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Below are given names and addresses of booksellers in different countries of the world for the convenience of customers. These booksellers usually carry stocks of our publications; in case any books are not readily available in their stock, they will register the order and supply in due course.

The publisher shall, however, continue to supply books direct to customers in whose countries there are no stockists of these publications.

AUSTRALIA

Melbourne University
Islamic Society
Parkville 3052
Victoria

Adyar Bookshop
Blavatsky Lodge of Theosophical Society
67 Castlereach Street
Sydney 2000

BERMUDA

Books & Gift Centre
P.O. Box 737
Devonshire 4-04

CANADA

Banyen Bookshop
2715 West IVth Avenue
Vancouver 8, B.C.

Mansfield Book Mart Ltd
2065 Mansfield Street
Montreal 2, P.Q.

Fifth Kingdom Bookshop
77 Harbord Street
Toronto 179, Ontario

CEYLON (Sri Lanka)

Lake House Bookshop
P.O. Box 244
100 Sir Chittampalam Gardinar Mawata
Colombo 2

Ansari Book Depot
106 & 108 Armour Street
Colombo 12

Cargills (Ceylon) Ltd.
P.O. Box 23
York Street
Colombo

FIJI ISLANDS

M. Ibrahim Khan
P.O. Box 42
Drumasi, P.O. Tavua

Maulana B.A. Diwan
G.P.O. Box 791
Suva

GERMANY (West)

Oriental Buchhandlung
AM FRIESENPLATZ
(E.J. BRILL. GMBH)
5 Cologne
Antwerpener Str. 6-12

GUYANA (S. America)

Khan Enterprises
47 High & Hadfield St.
George Town
Demerara

HONG KONG
Sambo's Library
P.O. Box No. 448
Hong Kong

INDONESIA
Tintamas
Karamat Raya 60
Djakarta

ITALY
Centro Islamico Culturale d'Italia
Via Salaria 290
00199 Rome

KENYA (East Africa)
H.O. Adam & Sons
P.O. Box 98008
Mombasa

KUWAIT
Kuwait Traders
P.O. Box 20210
Kuwait

MALAYSIA
Penang Store
General Merchants
3 Bishop Street
Penang

Minerva Book Store
98 Jalan Campbell
Kuala Lumpur 0-1-09

Jubilee (Book) Store Sdn. Bhd.
97, Jalan Tuanka Abdul Rahman
Kuala Lumpur

A.S. Noordeen
2509 Malayan Mansion
Jalan Masjid India
Kuala Lumpur

Marcan & Sons (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd.
P.O. Box 958
321, Jalan Tuanka Abdul Rahman
Kuala Lumpur

Pustaka Antara
399-A Jalan Tuanka Abdul Rahman
Kuala Lumpur

MAURITIUS
M.H.M. Lockhat & Sons
P.O. Box 271
Desforges Street
Port Louis

Islamic Book Service
P.O. Box 715
Port Louis

NEWZEALAND
University Bookshop (Auck) Ltd.
Students Union Building
34 Prince Street
Auckland 1

NIGERIA
Islamic Publication Bureau
P.O. Box 3881
Lagos

PHILIPPINES
Islamic Book Supply
226 N Domingo St.
JAN JUAN,
METRO MANILA

SAUDI ARABIA
Darul Kutub
P.O. Box 247
Jeddah

Al Maktaba Al Saifia
Madina Munawwara

Al-Eimeah Book Shop
Madina Munawwara

SINGAPORE

Marican & Sons (Malaysia) Ltd.
171, Middle Road
Singapore

Kazura Company
728, North Bridge Road
Singapore 7

SOUTH AFRICA

Taj Company
Booksellers
127, Prince Edward Street
Durban, Natal

M.I. Nana
Shop No. S. 223
South Mall
Oriental Plaza Main Road
Fordsburg,
Johannesburg 2092

E.M. Akhalwaya & Sons
50 Lovers Walk
Fordsburg
Johannesburg

Atlas Trading Co.
P.O. Box 4783
94, Wale Street
Cape Town

Islamic Book Centre
41 Madressa Arcade
Durban Tvl.

Sanjalvis Emporium
P.O. Box 6748
Johannesburg

Kitabistan
9 Madressa Arcade
Durban Tvl,

TANZANIA (E. Africa)

G.H. Hemani & Sons
Azikiwe Street
Post Box 854
Dar es Salaam

TRINIDAD (West Indies)

Anjuman Sunnut-ul-Jamat
Association of Trinidad
and Tobago
Jama Masjid
2, Queen Street
Port of Spain

UNITED KINGDOM

Luzac & Co. Ltd.
46 Great Russell Street
London WC 2

Bailey & Swinfen Ltd.
Foreign Booksellers
Minerva House
26/27 Hatton Garden
London, WC 1B 3PB

AD Orientem Limited
2 Cumberland Gardens
St. Leonard on Sea
Sussex

Mr. S.A.K. Rao
95 Newsom Road,
Huddersfield

Islamic Book Centre
125 Drummond Street
(Basement)
London NW1, 2HL

Muslim Welfare House
233 Seven Sisters Road
London N4 2DA

A. R. Bullock
62 Kelburne Road
Oxford OX4 3SH

R.N.B. Enterprises
70 Queens Road
Walthamstow
London E178 OW

Muslim Book Service
38 Mapesbury Road
London NW 2 4JD

Pak Printers & Booksellers
20 Highgate Road
Birmingham B12 OAX

Muslim Printers & Booksellers
(Paigham-e-Islam Trust)
423 Stratford Road
Birmingham B11 41B

U.S.A.

Specialty Promotions Co. inc.
6841, S. Cregier Ave
Chicago, Illinois, 60649

Kazi Publications
1529 N. Wells Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Books & Things,
106 Lenox Avenue
New York, NY, 10026

Shambala Booksellers
2482, Telegraph Avenue
Berkeley, Calif. 94704

Islamic Book Center
2551 Massachuesetts
Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20008

Samuel Weiser Inc
740 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10003

Brotherhood of Life Books
110 Dartmouth SE
Albuquerque
New Mexico, 87106

Rainbow Bridge
P.O. Box 40208
San Francisco, Cal. 94140

Bodhi Tree Bookstore Inc
8585 Melrose Ave
Los Angeles, Calif. 90069

Michael Oconner Islamic
Book Distributor
P.O. Box 27366
Philadelphia Pa. 19150

New World Enterprises
Banu Hilal Bookstop
133 Avenue "A"
P.O. Box No. 133
New York, N.Y. 10009

MSA Islamic Book Service
P.O. Box 264
Plainfield
Indiana 46168

Books on Islam Limited
336 West End Eve 16 C
New York, N.Y. 10023

Islamic Cultural Centre
of New York
One Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10023

Oriental Books 'N Things
215 S State St.
Ann Arbor
Michigan 48108

Yes! Yes Book Shop
31st Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20007

The American Islamic Book
Study, Inc.,
1000 Union Street
Brooklyn, New York,
N.Y. 11225